DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 868 EA 005 381

AUTHOR	Lloyd, Woodrow S.
TITLE	What Society May Properly Expect of the School. CTF Project on Education Finance: Document 1.
INSTITUTION	Canadian Teachers' Federation, Ottawa (Ontario).
REPORT NO	CTF-C-72307
PUB DATE	Sep 72
NOTE	70p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Canadian Teachers' Federation, 110 Argyle Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K2P 1B4 ($1.25)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Decision Making; Education; Educational Accountability; Educational Development; *Educational Economics; Educational Finance; *Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; *Educational Responsibility; Humanization; Human Relations; Nationalism; Parent School Relationship; Public Schools; Relevance (Education); *School Community Relationship; *School Role; Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS	*Canada; Social Needs

ABSTRACT

This booklet is the first in a three part series dealing with individual and societal expectations of education in Canada and the relationship between basic goals and the principles of financing. The main body of the presentation covers the current state of public expectations of school as an institution serving the needs of society. The author sees some Canadian education needs to be the need for (1) decisionmaking; (2) Canadian identity; (3) economic wellbeing; (4) the preservation and development of the environment; and (5) self-renewal of the individual and of society. A concluding chapter summarizes some additional requirements, such as the need to make an educational system that is accountable and responsive to history, and one that has clearly specified goals; effective school-to-parent and school-to-community relations; and student input into the educational process. A 42-item bibliography is included. Related documents are EA 005 382 and EA 005 383. (Author/DN)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 079868

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

C-72307

WHAT SOCIETY MAY PROPERLY EXPECT OF THE SCHOOL

Woodrow S. Lloyd

CTF Project on Education Finance: Document 1

EA 005 381

CANADIAN TEACHERS' FEDERATION
110 Argyle Avenue
Ottawa Ontario
K2P 1B4

September 1972

CTF PROJECT ON EDUCATION FINANCE

Document One: **Woodrow S. Lloyd.** What Society May Properly Expect of the School

Document Two: **Guy Rocher.** What the Individual Expects of the School

Document Three: **Walter Hettich, Barry Lacombe, Max von Zur-Muehlen.** Basic Goals and the Financing of Education

FOREWORD

The late sixties in Canada saw a rapid worsening of the climate for educators, who had enjoyed something like unquestioning acceptance for a brief period of years. American criticisms of the school system were gaining wide currency in Canada. On the one hand, it was asserted that the schools were tailored to the purposes of a specific economic system (with its social and political concomitants), and that that system was faltering if not altogether discredited. At the other pole, critics argued that the schools had become inefficient in serving the essential purposes of the prevailing social system. In the meantime, there was growing evidence that young people were increasingly unwilling to accept the authority of the school as a training and selecting device, and that parents and communities were unable or unwilling to compel them to go on doing so.

Against this background, the governmental agencies responsible for raising money for the support of the schools were beginning to assert with increasing firmness that taxpayers would no longer tolerate the growth of educational costs, and various restrictive measures were making their appearance.

The CTF Advisory Committee on Education Finance, which had for many years been concerning itself with the problem of financing the many unmet needs in education, concluded that the time was ripe for an attempt to define, at a basic level, the nature of the gap between current concepts of the proper function of the school in Canadian society and the reality of that function, and also the nature of the gap between current concepts of propriety in the public financing of schooling and the reality of the present situation. This would be the starting point for an attempt to explore the implications of an effort of improvement, and eventually to suggest some basic principles on which a rationale for the public financing of education should rest.

Accordingly, invitations were addressed, in the summer of 1970, to certain eminent Canadians to present their view of the concepts prevailing, at the present time, in Canadian society, regarding individual and societal expectations of education and the relationship between basic goals and principles of financing. In this paper, the late Dr. Woodrow Lloyd presents his views on the current state of public expectations of school as an institution serving the needs of the society. Dr. Lloyd was widely

known for his interest in the problems of social needs and public finance, and drew authority from the breadth and depth of his experience as a teacher, an education minister, and a provincial premier. His untimely death in the spring of 1971, while he was serving the United Nations in Korea, severed a long connection with the Canadian Teachers' Federation, dating from his term on its Board of Directors in 1940.

The other two papers in the series are by Dr. Guy Rocher and by Drs. Walter Hettich, Barry Lacombe and Max von Zur-Muehlen. The three papers in the series have provided the input for a series of seminars beginning in May 1971. A final report on the enquiry is expected to be published by the Canadian Teachers' Federation during the winter of 1972-73.

Norman Goble
Secretary General
Canadian Teachers' Federation

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
SOME DEMAND – AND REASON – FOR CHANGE	7
THE MAKING OF DECISIONS	16
CANADIAN IDENTITY	20
Indian and Eskimo Education	28
ECONOMIC WELL-BEING	32
THE USE AND ABUSE, PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT, OF OUR ENVIRONMENT	40
SELF RENEWAL – OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND OF SOCIETY	45
GLOBAL OBLIGATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES, IN A WORLD THAT "HURTS"	50
HUMAN RELATIONS	55
SUMMARY	58
REFERENCES	62

INTRODUCTION

Comments designed to outline and underline "the prevalent concept of what society may properly require of the educational system, and of the individual for whom society provides educational facilities" could be structured in almost as many different ways as there are people interested in thinking about such a topic. There is a bewildering lack of agreement about the aims and purposes of education. Even when there is agreement, the methods of achieving these aims and purposes are not always agreed to.

Moreover, consideration of education must not take place in a vacuum. In the end it is our total life purpose, our design for and conviction about society, that molds our thinking about education. The temptation to isolate and insulate education from the world about, or to relate it to the world that "was" rather than the world that "is", has been yielded to more often than ought to be the case:

> What is the aim of education is a question that admits of no answer without a reference to ultimate convictions about human nature and destiny, about society and how the individual stands related to it. (*Scottish Report on Secondary Education, 1947*)

Within any given nation, or even smaller community, there are certain to be differences in "ultimate convictions about human nature and destiny" and about "how the individual stands related to" society. And so there will be differing and conflicting opinions about what "society may properly require of the educational system". And there will be differing ideas about how a paper on such a topic might best be structured.

Allowing for – and even encouraging – the expression of such differences, a society must have some direction, even if a generalized one. That direction must be supported by some logic acceptable to a majority of the people:

> If the world is to exist as a coherent society, it will have to have its own logic, so that it will make sense to its inhabitants. (Donald N. Michael, as quoted in *Changing Life Patterns*)

That, one can assume, is at least equally true for the society which we build within our Canadian borders. Consequently, some "logic" which

makes "sense" to Canadians, some generally accepted "common denominators" of aims, purposes and procedures for education must exist and should be identified. Hopefully, the majority whose point of view is represented by such "common denominators" will always concede its fallibility; and the minority will accept the responsibility to strive for recognition of its views.

The American Association of School Administrators recently attempted to identify requirements similar to those which are the concern of this paper. In the spring of 1964, the President of that Association "appointed a special commission and charged it with responsibility for identifying major education imperatives that must be at the forefront as curriculums are modified, instructional methods revised, and organizational patterns reshaped to meet the educational needs of this country in one of its most dynamic periods".

Describing the commission's qualifications, the Executive Secretary of the Association commented:

> The members have had many years of experience as teachers, superintendents, and university faculty members; they have over the past many years regularly met with school boards, with committees of lay citizens, and with faculty members; and they are sensitive to the needs of children, to the pressures of society, and to the hard facts of budgetary appropriations.

After two years of study, the Commission identified nine "imperatives" in education and stated them as follows:

To make urban life rewarding and satisfying

To prepare people for the world of work

To discover and nurture creative talent

To strengthen the moral fabric of society

To deal constructively with psychological tensions

To keep democracy working

To make intelligent use of natural resources

To make the best use of leisure time

To work with other peoples of the world for human betterment.

Their definition and elaboration have been published in a book entitled *Imperatives in Education*. Even after such extensive and intensive consideration the following comment was made:

> The imperatives identified in this publication are not intended to be educational goals, nor do they encompass the entire educational program. Rather, they are points at which the educational program must be revised and reshaped to meet the needs of the times.

One possibility for this paper would have been to use (with some adaptation) these "imperatives" and attempt to develop them using Canadian examples, thus achieving Canadian flavour as to the "prevalent concept" of the "requirements" of the educational system.

Or, one might have made use of a traditional structure, such as the requirements:

To teach a body of knowledge

To develop and form character

To train to earn a living

To train the mind in intellectual development.

That structure appeals to me as limiting, or limited – and not enough in direct tune with specific realities of Canadian life in a world which doesn't respond to traditional treatment.

The possibilities of other permutations and combinations proliferate as one reads and considers the diversity of Canada and the differing needs which can be documented and demonstrated as one moves from region to region. Indeed there is a danger (to borrow and adapt a phrase of the late Martin Luther King) that "paralysis from analysis" can result. And perhaps that has happened in many discussions about Canadian education.

Anyway, for better or for worse, I propose to discuss Canadian "requirements" – and to attempt to find some "prevalent concept" – by reference to seven topics. As in the report of the AASA commission already quoted there is no presumption that these "encompass the entire educational program". Moreover, I confess to difficulty in providing comment which makes each topic stand out as distinct and different. I would like to think that the reason for this is the extent to which everything in education ought to be "cross-pollinated", and that a further reason is that we deal with whole human beings, not just a sum of non-related parts. Regardless of such qualification or attempted rationalization, the following topics are proposed:

1. The need for decision-making
2. The need for Canadian identity

3. Economic well-being – and the contribution of education

4. Our environment – its use and abuse, its preservation and development

5. Self-renewal – of the individual and of society

6. Global obligations and opportunities

7. Human relations.

Before attempting to assess those concepts (of "what society may properly require of education") which may be held within Canada we should note briefly some concepts proposed by a group who looked at education from a "global" view. In October 1967, 150 educational leaders from 52 countries met in Williamsburgh, Virginia, U.S.A. This "International Conference on the World Crisis in Education" was convened because it was felt "that the times required reassessment of the capabilities of education to meet the rising aspirations of people everywhere for a better and freer life". (Philip H. Coombs in *The World Educational Crisis)* In brief summary of the conference Coombs reports:

The conference subscribed to the following proposition:

1. That education is now a central preoccupation of every nation in the world and, further, that educational plans can be carried out with maximum success only if they are made in relation to educational systems and plans in other countries.

2. That within each country education can no longer be regarded as a series of unconnected enterprises, conducted at different levels with purposes independent of each other. Education within any society must be considered as a unified whole, its parts in balance and the balance in turn reflecting society's requirements and the resources available to meet them.

3. That there is indeed a crisis in education's ability to match performance with expectations. The crisis takes two forms. The first is the world-wide disparity between the hopes of individuals and the needs of society, on the one hand, and, on the other the capabilities of the educational system. The second is an even greater disparity between the developing countries, faced with the cruel restraints of grossly inadequate resources, and the developed countries, which are increasingly preoccupied with their own internal needs.

4. That in all countries, rich and poor alike, educational programs, structures, management, and the learning process itself require the most immediate attention to ways and means of replacing inflexibility with innovation, traditional or outmoded ideas with fresh approaches and new ventures.

The conference believed that "these postulates must be accepted both by educators and by the society that supports them if education is to rise above an attitude of business-as-usual and perform the tasks that the very future of mankind requires".

Coombs adds that "with these postulates securely in mind, the conference turned to the actions required to improve the performance of education in six areas: information about education, management and structure, teachers and students, curriculum content and teaching methods, resources, and international co-operation". (That list of "actions required" suggests still another way in which this paper might have been structured.)

On the first of these "action required" items, ("information about education"), let me include a few brief references from *The World Educational Crisis*. I do so because they fit the Canadian scene and deserve early mention in this discussion:

> To improve itself, an educational system must know what it is doing and how well it is doing. Further, if a society is to strengthen its educational system, many people besides educators must have access to the essential facts.

The *requirement* that "many people besides educators must have access to the facts" has not received a good enough priority in Canadian educational planning and effort. To establish that priority the conference recommended, among other measures, that "every educational system should establish effective machinery to evaluate its own performance on a continuing basis," and that "besides continuing self-evaluation, educational systems should periodically subject themselves to friendly but critical external scrutiny by their peers".

The conference included a reminder to "society itself" about its responsibility for more accurate and complete "information about education":

> A concern for proper information must also be directed toward society itself and particularly those parts that have the deepest interest

in education's performance. This concern requires two measures. The first is improved methods by which relevant information is made available. This is the responsibility of education. The second is improved understanding on the part of the media – the press, television, and radio – that are the main communication channels between education and the public. It is important that these media employ and support highly competent education reporters, trained and continually refreshed by contact with the educational world.

We have done too little about too much in this respect. Reflect for a moment on whether people generally have done less than you would like about education. Your conclusion may well be that they have done more than they have been asked to and better than we had a right to expect considering the explanations they have been given.

Educational systems frequently have too little respect, or at least concern, for the right of people to understand. The barrier to desirable change imposed by lack of understanding is too frequently underestimated. Equally important, if not more so, is the loss to education by not using the creative resources of ideas and hopes of people outside the sometimes closed circuit of the educational world. More will be said of this later but I felt it desirable to state, early and firmly, as one of the proper requirements of education, more and better "information about education"

SOME DEMAND—AND REASON—FOR CHANGE

Before directing attention to the specific topics I have suggested as "requirements", some generalized comment about our Canadian scene may be useful.

A paper discussing "the prevalent concept" of what society may "properly require" of the educational system and stating this "concept" in terms of "first principles" should "tell it like it is". In attempting to do so, to formulate a representative and comprehensive statement about the "prevalent concepts" of Canadians with respect to education, one faces an "Alice in Wonderland" type of question:

"Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?"

"That depends a good deal", said the Cat (with infallible logic)
"on where you want to go".

Have Canadians really decided where they want to go with respect to education? I fail to find evidence that would support a convinced "yes" as the answer. I doubt whether we have developed that level of definition or determination, that cohesion of ideas or articulation of thought, about education, which would provide a Canadian "prevalent concept". The "infallible logic" of the Cat's comment (applied to education in Canada) finds us pressed for an answer and certainly unable to respond in terms of "first principles" which have received widespread and considered endorsement.

Provided we are pursuing answers with intelligent vigour let us not go into public mourning because we have not so far achieved complete success. The vigorous pursuit of the answer (to "where you want to go") is the essence of dynamic democracy. Moreover, effective education is not static. The fact of an accelerating rate of change is one dominant characteristic of our society. Perhaps the widespread recognition of this does produce one "prevalent concept", namely that the educational system should prepare people better than it does for the enlarged demands produced by that change. Indeed education, if it performs its function of making people free, will enable people, through the competent exercise of their collective will, to take charge of that change.

While it would be dangerous to think that we in our day invented change – and thereby lose the lessons of history – it is important to

recognize the current "increase in the velocity of history". It is of urgent importance to be convinced of the requirement this imposes on the educational system – on those who operate it and on those who make use of the opportunities it offers. This "increase in the velocity of history" can easily be dramatized by reference to man landing on the moon, to technological change in more ways than man ever dreamed of, to the "population explosion", to growing urbanization at home, to the emergence of new nations abroad or to the general rising level of expectations. Probably the most dramatic "increase" of all can be seen in the main constituents of education, Canada's young people. Their change in attitude and belief with regard to their relationship with institutions, with other people and with each other must have profound meaning for those who would define what society may "properly require" of the educational system.

Just as change in society is not a modern invention, neither is the debate about what the educational system should be trying to achieve. For example, Aristotle (who is hardly a contemporary commentator) wrote:

> It is not at all clear whether the pupils should practise pursuits that are practically useful, or morally edifying, or higher accomplishments – for all these views have won the support of some judges; all men do not honour the same virtue, so that they naturally hold different opinions in regard to training in virtue. (*Politics* VIII)

In 1960 Jerome S. Bruner noted a broadening of the debate:

> A considerable portion of our population has become interested in a question that until recently was the concern of specialists: "What shall we teach and to what end?" (*The Process of Education*)

In 1970, when the Canadian Teachers' Federation seeks to set out "first principles" which guide "the prevalent concept of what society may properly require of the educational system", the search and the debate continue. The need for this continuing search for intelligent answers to searching questions – using the old and new of information and experience – may warrant in itself the prominence of a "first principle".

The debate has produced a considerable amount of spoken and written comment. Books, articles and reports on "the Aims of Education" are dust-gatherers on many a shelf and speeches on the same topic proliferate from podiums well scattered from sea to sea. Information – or

that which is advanced as such – and proposals abound, but clarification and wide public acceptance escape us. In someone's phrase, we face the "paradox of a poverty of perspective in the midst of a growing abundance of data". Understandably then, the comment made (with infallible logic) by the Cat from Alice in Wonderland is raised with increasing force and frequency. One might conclude that uncertainty about educational aims (and also the practices to achieve them) and the hope for clarification is in itself a "prevalent concept".

The concept held by some – of where we are and whether we can get elsewhere soon enough – is highly critical and exceedingly pessimistic. The September 19 (1970) issue of *Saturday Review* turns its attention to education as the United States enters the 70's. Considering education in that country, James Cass (Education Editor) makes the point:

> The decade of the Sixties was a revolutionary epoch in American education, but the revolution was not in the schools. . . powerful forces for educational reform ... (civil rights movement and student rebellion) ... stirred widespread ferment and dramatized the desperate need for radical reformation of the educational enterprise, but ultimately they proved only how resistant our educational institutions are to change.

Looking back over more decades than the latest one he notes a dramatic change, from absolute confidence to incessant questioning. Fifty years ago, he says, the "concept of free public education for all children embodied the highest ideals of an expanding democracy". Today, he suggests, *some* critics are even "questioning the traditional concept of schooling itself in an age when knowledge is accessible from so many different sources". The nation, he claims, is experiencing a "crisis of confidence in its schools".

From other articles in the same series come criticism and condemnation such as the following:

> ... declining faith in educational institutions is threatening the idea of education itself
> ... evidence indicates that in some school systems the smart ones drop out and the dumb ones continue
> ... a system ... that ... sentences everyone to twelve years of schooling ... can and must be judged by its failures

... the boredom, the emptiness ... the sheer waste of the average classroom.
The schools do what they do out of structural necessity ... because social mythology permits very little else
... schools are stiff, unyielding, microcosmic versions of a world that has already disappeared.

In the concluding article John Fischer (President of Teachers' College Columbia University) is more hopeful:

> The current dissatisfaction is focused on the system ... there is convincing evidence that criticism ... stems mainly from a pervasive desire for better, not less education.

It may well be that James Cass states a "prevalent concept" – and one acceptable to Canadians – in these words:

> The fundamental task for education in the Seventies ... [is] to help, or force, the schools to become more responsive to the varied needs of children, to open up the system so that its most repressive and destructive characteristics are mitigated, if not eliminated, to remember that children, too, are human beings who deserve to be treated with as much dignity and respect as other humans, to keep clearly in mind that the objective is the development of children, not the preservation of an institution. And, perhaps most difficult of all, ways must be sought to nurture a wider spectrum of youthful talents and tastes, aptitudes and aspirations.

He argues for offering students "the dignity of independence". He notes that the "free schools" being experimented with may provide us with useful models. He endorses the belief (and thereby expresses the hope) that "teachers can be trained to function as facilitators of learning in an open classroom rather than as authoritarian oracles behind closed doors".

Those are quotations from and comments about United States experience. Are there similar comments from Canadian sources? Not quite that I know of, although the "Hall-Dennis Report" from Ontario had some things to say in similar vein, even if less harshly phrased. And there is some added opinion in the September 1970 issues of two Canadian publications, *MacLean's* and *Weekend Magazine*. Probably neither *MacLean's* nor *Weekend* would claim the erudition of *Saturday Review*. But both are competent in reflecting the point of view of many Canadians.

"Is your school obsolete?" shouts the cover of *Weekend Magazine*, September 12, 1970. (*Weekend's* cover also assures us that it is "read by more Canadians than any other magazine".) Bold black letters inside the cover state emphatically "Your child is getting an inferior education" and only slightly smaller red letters rephrase the cover question to ask "How obsolete is your school?" (One gathers that the editors presume the cover question is answered by the headline and all that remains is haggling about the amount of obsolescence.)

"Back to school ... why?" asks the cover of *MacLean's* (September, 1970). (*MacLean's* cover stakes a claim as "Canada's National Magazine".) "Is your child wasting eight years of his life in today's primary schools?" is the headline over the actual article.

The questions raised by the two magazines are based for the most part on things done and things said in British Columbia and Ontario. By no means are the questions confined to these two magazines or these two provinces. There is "a prevalent concept" that those of us who have shared responsibility for the "educational system" have done an inadequate job of:

(a) at least, interpreting to the public the roles and goals of the "system";

(b) defining and describing these roles and goals even for internal school use;

(c) convincing many people (including, in particular, increasing numbers of young people) that roles and goals as currently observed are adequate.

There is an increasing "velocity" also to the extent and quality of questioning which challenges the effectiveness and indeed the "rightness" of the roles and goals as pronounced and practised. There is growing public opinion – much of it well-informed and serious – on the side of the Cat and the infallible logic of its question. There is, I suggest, a prevalent concept that better answers about where we want to go are essential – and urgent.

There are those who will say that this search for roles and goals which would allow man to better measure and master today's total life environment is the search for a drug for which no disease has been invented. In support of their thesis they can pose quantitative arguments showing increased number of students, increased opportunities, and even an increased Gross National Product. No one will dispute such facts or deny

the achievement they represent. But all of us should question the extent to which such facts define the real, or total, function of education. (To those who get complete assurance from a steadily fattening Gross National Product I would refer the comment of John W. Gardner, formerly U.S. Commissioner of Education, that "part of our problem is how to stay awake on a full stomach.")

Undoubtedly those who are so content have a satisfying personal answer with regard to means and ends of education. That answer may accommodate their particular perspective on life and society's future. With respect, I claim that there are many more who find too little comfort in things as they are. They find too little comfort in where their education left them in the middle of today. They are worried lest it leave their children in a muddle tomorrow. They opt for considerable change, qualitative and quantitative, and this establishes the need for change as a prevalent concept of what is required in our day.

Onetime Nobel Peace Prize winner Sir Norman Angell puts a qualitative argument for change in education in these words:

> The point at which our education fails may perhaps be indicated by this fact: the knowledge which might have prevented the worst errors of this century was already in the possession of those who made the errors. They failed to apply to the guidance of policy the knowledge they already possessed – truths, that is, inherent in the commonplace facts of daily life about them. ... The content and method of education must be reshaped along lines...the conventional educationist is apt to resist. ("World Tensions and the Education of Man", reprinted 1962 by the *Toronto Education Quarterly*)

Some will agree, some will disagree. Those who agree that far-reaching change is the "requirement" will not necessarily agree on the nature of the change. Some indeed will argue that today's educational achievement is inferior to that of the "good old days". More, in my opinion, will challenge today's achievement, not by measurement against "a world that has already disappeared", but rather because it doesn't fully equip people to cope with today's total, and changing, environment.

To state a "prevalent concept" of society's requirements requires more than a physical procedure of collecting and collating. Value judgments will inevitably intrude and influence the selection of which concepts are claimed as valid and prevalent. The bias of the writer – and of the reader – are obviously brought into play, and possibly into conflict.

Hopefully there are some postulates (or "common denominators") that command near total support. Support of education should mean "an active commitment to the dignity of every human being". A declaration of faith in education is stated or supported in the opening paragraph of *Living and Learning* ("The Hall-Dennis Report" from Ontario):

> The underlying aim of education is to further man's unending search for truth. Once he possesses the means to truth, all else is within his grasp. Wisdom and understanding, sensitivity, compassion, and responsibility, as well as intellectual honesty and personal integrity, will be his guides in adolescence and his companions in maturity.

Let's affirm in addition that mass education, with a forward thrust, willing to challenge any claimed natural right of any human structure or institution, is the "richest capital at mankind's command". Such an assessment gets support from this quotation:

> Viewed as a form of wealth, as an element of human dignity, and as a means of development, education is not merely an axiomatic response to a world wide need. It is a modern experiment in improving the quality of the human family. It is central to the hopes and expectations of people throughout all countries in the world. (AASA, *Imperatives in Education*)

Faith in education as "an active commitment to the dignity of every human being", as part of "man's unending search for truth", as a process with a right to "challenge" existing – or proposed – institutions, as a "modern experiment in improving the quality of human life"; these I hope have wide enough endorsement to qualify as "common denominators".

These statements assume that education is more than preparation for profitable employment. They assume that, in addition to an increase in knowledge, more education for more people brings also added and improved social and political capacity and understanding. Some may question whether this has happened. Few, I hope, will question that it ought to happen.

Value judgments intrude at once when we consider, as a legitimate dividend from education, the will and capacity to challenge the claimed "rights" or even procedures of existing human institutions. But if "the underlying aim of education is to further man's unending search for

truth" the legitimacy of such a dividend cannot be denied. There will also be conflict of opinion if we advance the idea of George Bereday ("School Systems and Mass Demand", in *Essays on World Education*): "Most human systems are designed not to promote but to retard change". (Education is one of the "human systems" referred to.) However the same statement also supports the need for searching enquiry.

Indeed, the conflict of value judgments does in itself suggest that more complete and reasoned assessment would be useful. Perhaps there is guidance in these reflections:

> You cannot separate the just from the unjust
> and the good from the wicked,
>
> For they stand together before the face of the sun
> even as the white thread and the whole thread are
> woven together,
>
> And when the white thread breaks, the weaver shall look
> into the whole cloth and he shall examine the loom also.
> (Kahlil Gibran in *The Prophet)*

There is, I suggest, a concept held by many that searching examination of "the whole cloth" of education is due or overdue. That includes an examination of the system which produces it, "the loom also". Those who doubt that should go into the streets and into the fields and particularly into wherever young people gather for serious discussion – and just listen.

There is not only difficulty in determining what is "the prevalent concept" about education's proper role in our society. There can be danger in using it as an over-riding authority for future decision. The danger is that the prevalent concept may too exclusively reflect a cultural and occupational structure that is a static hierarchy. Its decision and direction may be to reproduce today's "pecking order" in society. Education can be a method of "imperialism" whereby one generation extends, or seeks to extend, an authoritarian and exploitive influence over succeeding generations. That conflicts with the aim of education "to further the unending search for truth". It may frustrate that function of education which is to prepare people to challenge the structure and alleged "rights" of human institutions. We should remember that not infrequently the history of human progress recognizes, as the real initiators of worthwhile progress, ideas and people consigned by an earlier "prevalent concept" to that outer darkness reserved for all that is dangerous and destructive.

Such consigning may be done by a so-called "elite". As Sir Norman Angell wrote (in "World Tensions and the Education of Man"):

> ... the existence of an intellectual and academic elite of high philosophical and scientific attainment does not necessarily correct or even influence for the better the quality of public judgment.

To support his statement he noted, among others, the history of ancient Athens and Nazi Germany.

In the opinion of Walter Lippman the difficulty may come from another source entirely: "Mass opinion has shown itself to be (on occasion) a dangerous master when the stakes are life and death". He adds "the unhappy truth is that prevailing public opinion has been destructively wrong at critical junctures. The people have imposed a veto upon the judgments of informed and responsible officials. ..." We should of course appropriately speculate on whether such "mass opinion" might not indeed have given different direction if it had been fully informed and freed. But it is with things as they are that we must deal. My point is that the "prevalent concept" is not by itself a final authority from which educational leadership can proceed. It should be recognized. Since real change depends on conviction and not just on decree it is a pertinent factor in decision-making. But merely to stir together a number of "prevalent concepts" and use the resulting mixture as an educational diet to sustain us can incapacitate rather than strengthen.

Let me now turn to those more specific items about which I propose to structure this discussion of what "society may require of the educational system and of the individual for whom society provides educational facilities". It was a very conscious choice that placed preparation for "the making of decisions" as the first of such topics.

THE MAKING OF DECISIONS

Through education society can formulate its own purposes, can organize its own means and resources, and thus shape itself with definiteness and economy in the direction in which it wishes to move.

– John Dewey, in *My Pedagogic Creed*

As long ago as 1911 John Dewey saw the development by society of decision-making ability as an important function of the educational system. Another quotation, this time from contemporary writing, which might have been used to introduce this section is:

> The future of the future is therefore what we determine it to be, both individually and collectively. It is directly related to how we conceive of its possibilities, potentials and implications. Our mental blueprints are its basic action programs – whether immediate or not depends on the individual and his society. (John McHale in *The Future of the Future*)

A "planning" society or a "planned" society? The distinction is real. Whether our commitment is to develop a "planning" society or to accept a "planned" society is crucial. There should be no argument about the commitment of education. It is to a society in which the collective will of the people, a will which is sensitive as well as sensible because people have been given a chance to develop and articulate such a will, is the decisive influence. A "planning" society will result only from conscious choice. We can drift into a "planned" society:

> If we do not carefully and intelligently shape our present, time and circumstance will dictate our future. Every nation that has abandoned struggle to rely on luck has invariably discovered how fickle the lady is. (Harold Howe as U.S. Commissioner of Education in *Picking Up the Options*)

There should be no doubt about the consequences of failure to commit education to the preparation of people for "intelligently" shaping our present – and future. Society is too complex to run itself. If people collectively allow decision-making to go by default – or are incapable of doing otherwise – someone will make the plan. The resulting "plan" may well have loyalty to interests other than the total public interest.

A "plan" so derived might even be benevolent enough though it denies the real meaning of the democratic process as suggested by "government by the people". It has a further deficiency. It fails to develop people. It fails to take advantage of the strengths and ideas of people just as it fails to nurture their idealism. It may indeed contribute to apathy and create hostility. Those who are concerned with violent expression of dissent, or are aware of apparent lack of enthusiasm for things as they are in today's society, should ponder this statement of Harold Laski:

> Men do not resent an environment when they feel that they share adequately in its making and in the end for which it is made. But they are bound to be at least apathetic, and possibly hostile, when the sense is wide and deep that they are no more than its instruments. *(Liberty in the Modern State)*

That too commends itself as "infallible logic".

It has widespread ramifications for those who design or seek to influence and those who operate our educational systems. The schools must motivate and equip people so that "government by consent" reflects consent with understanding and commitment.

> Public opinion is the ultimate reliance of our society only if it be disciplined and responsible. It can be disciplined and responsible only if habits of open mindedness and of critical inquiry are acquired *in the formative years* of our citizens... *It is the special task of teachers* to foster those habits of open mindedness and critical inquiry. ... by precept and by practice ... by the very atmosphere they generate ... they must be exemplars of open mindedness and free inquiry. They cannot carry out their task if the conditions for the practice of a responsible and critical mind are denied to them. They must have the freedom of responsible inquiry by thought and action into the meaning of social and economic ideas, into the checkered history of social and economic dogma. (Mr. Justice Frankfurter in 1952 U.S. Supreme Court case re loyalty oaths for public employees including teachers)

We should underline Mr. Justice Frankfurter's emphasis of "the habits of open mindedness and critical inquiry" to be acquired in "the formative years". That becomes a function of the educational system if we really believe that "public opinion" should be the "ultimate reliance of our society". We should note too that this will not be achieved unless teachers are supported in responsible inquiry "into the meaning of social

and economic ideas, into the checkered history of social and economic dogma''. And unless teachers have the will and the courage to do so.

The increasingly complex nature of the decisions which face society does of course make effective exercise of the collective will more difficult. The situation is further complicated by the constant bombardment of peoples' minds by increasingly powerful media and increasingly skillful use of this power. I assume it was that factor which moved Dr. Neville Scarfe of the University of British Columbia to write:

> Schools must be a means of decreasing the incidence of public gullibility and susceptibility to emotional persuasion and subtle propaganda ... human beings can be kept in chains economically, intellectually and emotionally by clever suggestion and diabolical persuasion. (''The Aims of Education in a Free Society'')

Lyman Bryson underlines the point: ''for our own safety ... [we must be] able to distinguish between significant truth, plausible falsehood and beguiling half truth''.

Marshall McLuhan gives emphasis to similar responsibility of the educational system:

> ... to develop an awareness about print and the newer technologies of communication so that we can orchestrate them, minimize their mutual frustrations and clashes, and get the best out of each in the educational process. ... Without an understanding of media grammars, we cannot hope to achieve a contemporary awareness of the world in which we live.

Sometimes we forget that young people are ''plugged in'' to much of the news and information and emotion that was once reserved for adults. We can't afford to ''unplug'' them at the school door – or require them to leave their plugs at home. McLuhan's advice to develop ''understanding of media grammars'', to get the best out of the ''technologies of communication'' in ''the educational process'' would seem to warrant designation as an educational requirement – for its own sake and particularly if there is to be rational decision-making.

If we do not wish to submit more and more to a ''planned society'', if on the contrary we consciously choose to develop a ''planning society'', in charge of its own destiny, we will ask our school systems to provide more opportunities for developing the skills of decision-making. Greater

personal and collective dividends, more satisfied people and more satisfying society can result. Let me reach even further back into time than John Dewey for a closing quotation:

> But to speak practically and as a citizen, ... I ask for ... better government. Let every man make known what kind of government would command his respect, and that will be one step toward obtaining it. (Henry David Thoreau)

CANADIAN IDENTITY

The critical weakness of our society is that for the time being our people do not have great purposes which they are united in wanting to achieve. The public mood of the country is defensive, to hold on to and to conserve, not to push forward and to create. We talk about ourselves as if we were a completed society, one which has achieved its purposes, and has no further great business to transact.

—Walter Lipmann, quoted in
National Purpose, 1960

National identity has been described as "that spirit which transforms a people into a citizenry and turns a territory into a nation". A nation is obviously more than a geographical blob with distinct boundaries – even though those boundaries are largely "undefended" and the geography tied together by trans-country railways, airline systems and a highway. It is more than the sum of its parts. Other, and stronger, distinguishing characteristics become increasingly important in days of "instant" communication, of complex technology, of multi-national corporations and great concentrations of population, wealth and political power in other parts of the world. "It is in the soul of the people that the Canadian identity can be found" says the Hall-Dennis Report. That report continues: "Canadians sense an identity that is not rooted in Britain, France or America, but in themselves and their own land".

The need for such an identity has twin roots. Without sense and definition of our own identity we cannot chart the patterns of internal Canadian development or the scope of our horizons. Nor can we determine (and even less fill) our part, increasingly important and complex, as one of the world's family of nations. "Know thyself" is generally considered basic advice to any individual. It is equally important for every nation.

The search (real or postured) for a national identity in Canada has been extensively talked about and sometimes acted on. Many events in our history, including the fact that earlier Canadians structured our country as a political and geographical entity, probably spring from that search. The search, and steps to implementation, have resulted in things and institutions somewhat "tailor-made" to deal with the needs or desires of a people living close to a powerful neighbour. The C.P.R. and the C.N.R., later joined by the C.B.C. and T.C.A., may serve as examples

of institutions developed to promote or serve Canada as a nation. At least in part they were a response to what might happen if we failed to provide tangible Canadian ties with decision-making power in Canadian hands. Undoubtedly some served other ends. Undoubtedly, too, there were visionaries among the originators who merit Canada's profound thanks. The question today is the extent to which we as Canadian people support and properly exploit these institutions to develop a "national identity".

Anyone even moderately informed about Canadian development can add to the list of institutions or arrangements with similar promise or potential. The list could include federal-provincial fiscal agreements and shared health, education, welfare and development programs. The National Film Board, the National Research Council, the Public Archives of Canada, the National Library, and the Canada Council would have to be included.

Some have very direct implications for education. The function and future of all – presuming that public programs reflect the needs, desire and consent of the people – are dependent on some total concept accepted by (and hopefully acceptable to) Canadians. What happens in our schools to provide understanding and motivation becomes important for the future of such efforts. What happens in schools has to do, in part, with "that spirit which transforms a people into a citizenry".

What happens in our schools influences the desire and understanding which determines whether the people living within the geographical designation of the nation are to be in charge of their own affairs. The extent to which we are, can be, even should aim to be, in charge of our own Canadian affairs is the basis of a debate which commands increasing attention and generates increasing tensions. Recent evidence of this is provided by the public discussion after the 1970 sale of two Canadian publishing companies to United States interests. (In this general area it is of interest to recall a statement made 20 years before by B.K. Sandwell to the Royal Commission on the Arts, Letters and Sciences: "Canada is the only country of any size in the world whose people read more foreign periodicals than they do periodicals published in their own land, local newspapers excluded.")

The debate is carried on in every political party, in many organizations and in many public forums. There are, of course, those who claim that all is well, not to worry. The crocuses bloomed this spring on

Parliament Hill, the G.N.P. increased last year, we periodically elect our own governments and select our own ambassadors. On the other hand, there are those who insist that a loss of "identity" has already resulted from a major surrender of resources and the consequent reduction of the political and economic power needed if we are to make independent Canadian decisions. They will argue that the identity-determining opportunities lost extend from how we distribute investment and benefits to part of what happens in our educational institutions. The Hall-Dennis Report has a useful summary:

> ... there are a significant number of Canadians who are disturbed about the way in which the country is maturing. One matter about which they are disturbed is the economic and cultural dependence on foreign countries, particularly the United States, that present Canadian circumstances reflect. They document the extent to which Canada has surrendered independence. They recognize that the "one world" concept demands some surrender of national sovereignty. At the same time, however, they believe that the nation which cannot control its economic resources cannot control its national destiny or its culture, and that of all the economically advanced nations, Canada is the one with the largest proportion of its industry and resources controlled from outside its borders.

After that summation the report concludes that:

> ... one of the major problems posed for Canada is how to preserve the vision of national development that the Fathers of Confederation had, and at the same time, accommodate herself to her dependence on, or interdependence with, other countries.

Indeed, I suggest, the first step in accommodating ourselves to "interdependence with other countries", without getting lost in the process, is to get a firm grip on what happens in our own backyard. Society has a proper right to require that the educational system recognizes this "major problem" and help equip people to cope with it.

A Canadian identity assumes the existence of Canadian goals. Agreement about comprehensive Canada-wide goals, and consistency of effort to achieve them, will be dependent in part on some degree of consistency (of direction and effort) in our various educational systems. It is not the function of this paper to attempt any complete or near complete list of such goals. Such decisions should come out of the decision-

making process available to and used by people and of that I have attempted some discussion.

Nor is it our function here to do more than remind ourselves of such well-known (if too frequently not mentioned) phenomena as disparity of opportunity between regions of Canada and within each region. Statistical evidence of disparity in income, housing, educational and health development, is readily available and should be freely admitted. We need to admit that we have not yet found the Canadian wisdom, desire or means to "mobilize our imagination, our personal sense of indignity and outrage, if we are to act on the conviction that gross poverty, curable illness, racial indignity, mental disease, and suffering in old age are a disgrace amidst the surrounding luxuries, privileges and indulgence of such a wealthy society as ours". (Adlai Stevenson, quoted in *National Purpose*) If such is really "a national purpose" then we need to consider what the educational systems can do that they haven't done to "mobilize our imagination, our personal sense of indignity and outrage" and so develop the individual and collective "conviction" to obliterate this "disgrace". Society can properly require the educational system to live more completely and more vigorously in the world of reality – even if it hurts somewhat and possibly some people. Certainly a sizeable group of young people, our prime educational constituents, are urging just that. In doing so they are thinking in terms which are Canada-wide and indeed global. They would welcome a more meaningful and intense response by educational institutions.

The problem of greater unanimity for educational goals in a country like Canada in which political authority for education is placed in the hands of ten separate and (for this purpose) autonomous provinces is not one to be lightly dismissed. (Unanimity is not used to suggest the kind of standardization and central decision-making which can be the peril of education and indeed of civilization.) Even so we should consider whether the role of education in developing a real Canadian identity has been pursued with enough vigour.

The 1949-1951 Royal Commission on the Arts, Letters and Sciences was a noteworthy effort which (depending on one's definition of "education") uncovered for public examination some of the blank pages in our Canadian book of achievements. (It did more than "uncover", much more, of course.) The more recent Royal Commission on Bilingualism and and Biculturalism has drawn attention to, and proposed, some writing for other pages.

Some federal financial support and indeed some direct responsibility for education is a Canadian fact. This indicates that although there is no clear road through the constitutional jungle there are trails which can be used. Moreover, there are cultural, political and economic forces to justify wrestling (or continuing to wrestle) with the role of education in helping Canadian people build a more definitive concept of "nationhood". Some of these forces have resulted in periodic examinations which stretch from an 1895 Dominion Education Association discussion on "A National or Central Bureau of Education for Canada" to the 1969 reports of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

In part, I believe, to further consideration of such an all-Canadian effort Education Ministers from the provinces have proclaimed a "Council of Education Ministers". I wish them well – but, as a former long-time member of the club, I'm not too optimistic. We can find some encouragement from the existence, somewhere in the bowels of the Department of the Secretary of State in Ottawa, of an embryonic organization of recent origin. It is given responsibility related to "the encouragement of the literary, visual and performing arts, learning and cultural activities". Admittedly some careful draftsmen used the word "learning" and so avoided the word "education", but the organization has at least some of the functions and more of the potential which a "Canadian Office of Education" might perform.

There are many who feel that a stronger and more definitive effort of this kind is needed to give spirit and muscle to the Canadian nation. Given the difficulty of Canada's geography, history and cultural climate, this poses a political question of considerable complexity. But a federal presence need in no way diminish the role of provincial governments. Co-operatively developed and sensitively executed, it can facilitate and strengthen the provincial role.

Indeed – though one should be careful not to read too much into the statement – the Royal Commission on Arts, Letters and Sciences commented:

> If the federal government is to renounce its right to associate itself with other social groups, public and private, in the general education of Canadian citizens, it denies its intellectual and moral purpose, the complete conception of the common goal is lost, and Canada, as such, becomes a materialistic society.

Dr. J. A. Corry (former Principal of Queen's University) put the case this way:

> In any vital federal system, the province must be able to shape the main features of education in and for the province. On the other hand, if there is indeed a nation to be spoken for and protected, then the federal government must speak for the nation, take steps to ensure its survival and nourish its growth. If the nation is also a living community, it cannot be shut out of all influence on the direction of education.

Mr. Robert Stanbury MP included that comment by Dr. Corry in an address to the 1967 Canadian Teachers' Federation conference on education finance. After that and other supporting reference he added:

> Education needs a Minister of its own speaking for it in our federal government ... not just for a particular program or a special group, but for *education* as a matter of crucial importance to Canada; speaking for it in the Cabinet, in the House, in the Country. A learning secretariat, with the support and leadership of a dynamic Minister, could provide a focal point for public consciousness of education's vital national importance. (*The Piper and the Tune*)

Because of the relatively recent extensive and intensive work of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism it is as unnecessary as it would be unwise to attempt to treat that vast and complicated Canadian matter in a paper of this kind. However, the very reasons which gave rise to the Commission constitute some requirements of Canadian society of our educational systems and as such cannot be overlooked and should not be underrated. A nation that is more than a territory, a citizenry that is more than a collectivity of people, must to some degree develop a "common cultural milieu". We must at least understand and appreciate and encourage the "cultural milieu" of our parts. We'll be unlikely to do so unless more Canadians tomorrow are able to read the publications and literature, respond to the drama and hear the thoughts expressed in a language which is indigenous, natural and official in areas of the country where they don't happen to live.

"The language of a group of people ... is the reflection and mirror of those who speak it, the vehicle of their thoughts and dreams", said the Royal Commission on Education in the Province of Quebec (the Parent Commission). Too many of us have denied ourselves some of the richness of Canadian life as well as a more precise perception of

what Canada is and may be because that "vehicle" has escaped us. Because there have been too many of us, some of the completeness of Canada's identity or character has never developed. We must at least better achieve that respect (and tolerance) on which there can be based intellectual co-operation between the parts of our nation and within the parts.

More, so much more, is involved than just the teaching, or learning, of another language so that the individual may have more scope in personal employment or the chance to enjoy another radio or TV channel. We deal with Canada and its future, its internal development and its exterior role. Let me quote – too briefly – from Book II (Education) of the Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism:

> We have pointed out that learning the second language, for instance, does not ensure awareness, understanding, and sensitivity to the traditions and aspirations of the second culture. In order to achieve understanding and effective communication between the two cultures, attention must be drawn not only to the language but to the society itself. The aim here is to make Canadians so conscious of our cultural duality that they will be accustomed to think of cultural partnership as one of the factors to be weighed when decisions are made.

A comment of the Hall-Dennis Report is worthy of note – as addition and reminder:

> History has played a decisive role in shaping Canadian society ... We determined to build our nation ... upon the irrevocable recognition that French and English were here as a fact of history: in consequence we accepted as part of the evolving social fabric a dual pattern of common law and civil law and of ethnic, regional and sectarian interests.

The same report does not leave the reminder at that point. It adds:

> It is something to work for this social fabric; for it must embrace not only our founding cultures, but those that spring from other ethnic roots.

To elaborate the need for this wider "embrace" it later asks:

> ... where must the immigrant whose background is neither British nor French fit, and how can he use his cultural background to contribute to the Canadian whole?"

(Hopefully, it is recognized that the same question is legitimate for those many second or third generation Canadians whose parents earlier came to Canada as immigrants.) It is noted that "researchers at the Dominion Bureau of Statistics indicate "the other European group is increasing rapidly". And that "more liberal immigration laws will produce a steadier flow of non-whites from many parts of the world". So steadied by statistics and stirred by expectations, the Commission, somewhat cautiously, and then only partially, concludes:

> If the increase of the "other European" and the "non-European" categories in the population is not accidental but a marked sociological trend, one wonders if now is the time to think not of Canadian biculturalism but of Canadian multi-culturalism.

Naturally and expectedly, representatives of some "other-European" groups have advanced the same idea with much more precision and emphasis. Their case may not have the same constitutional and historical roots but it is in Canada's interest to listen. They are Canadians – that should be adequate justification. Nor indeed do I see any conflict between such proposals and those stated in support of bilingualism and biculturalism.

Our Canadian identity cannot afford to harbour as a "critical weakness" a failure to have "great purposes" in which we are united. Nor can we afford erosion of the Canadian right or opportunity to have as many as possible decisions, which determine our destiny, "made in Canada" by Canadians. Society can expect the educational system to motivate and equip for strengthening the Canadian identity, for enlivening "the spirit which transforms a people into a citizenry". That takes more than a picture of the Queen in most classrooms and a Canadian flag (even if new) flying from every school flag pole. It means knowing Canada and believing in Canada. It means understanding of and respect for Canadian diversity and differences in culture. It means seeing Canada with an independent, self-determined, role in our association with other nations. It requires the formulation of Canadian purposes and goals to challenge our strength and stir our imagination. It demands a greater all-Canadian effort to provide the means for equalizing educational opportunity – between the regions of Canada and within the regions.

Let me run a calculated risk in relying at this point on a quotation from a United States president. The late John F. Kennedy in a 1963 message to Congress recommending a National Education Improvement Act linked education and national purpose with these words:

> Improved education is essential to give meaning to our national purpose and power. It [national purpose] requires skilled manpower and brainpower ... And it requires an electorate with sufficiently broad horizons and sufficient maturity of judgment to guide this nation safely through whatever lies ahead.

The development of "skilled manpower and brainpower", of "broad horizons and sufficient maturity", are properly included among those matters to be required of the educational system. And they are properly linked with giving "meaning to" national purpose and consequently giving distinctive shape to our Canadian identity.

Indian and Eskimo Education

The needs and rights of those whose ancestors were the original inhabitants of our country are different and demanding. They are sufficiently different and demanding to warrant a special section in a paper such as this. I choose, however, to include them in the section dealing with this topic – the topic of Canadian Identity. I do so with the hope that such allocation in itself makes a point. We deal with Canadians – with diversity and difference and problems and strength arising therefrom. It is as Canadians whose ancestors came as conquerors or immigrants and whose authority stemmed from greater power (economic power and military power) dealing with those who were first in Canada that we must develop our relationships and accept our responsibility.

How we do this has a meaning for Canadian identity. It is within the concept of Canadian identity – how we see ourselves and how others see us – that in my opinion lies the greatest hope of satisfactory acceptance of responsibility to those whose ancestors were the original Canadians. In our struggles to reconcile and draw strength from facts of "biculturalism" we should remember not only "the other Europeans" but also those whose culture was that of the first inhabitants.

The numbers are not large. There are about 250,000 Indians and 15,000 Eskimos among our Canadian citizens. Admittedly, the quantitative problem is increased because our performance of educational and other responsibilities has not kept pace with time and circumstance. The problem of quality which recognizes the contrast and even conflict of cultures does extend the dimensions of responsibility. But the resources of the Canadian nation should not be staggered by the size of the contribution required.

Must we not admit that we have allowed ourselves the luxury of many excuses? And suffered from short-sightedness? Have we not also been guilty of allowing feelings of superiority to undermine understanding and circumscribe conscience? We equated being white with being right. Our grand design was to build in our own image. Those who did not accept (or even could not accept) that image were denied the dividends.

One illustration of this is that education has measured, and reported, and consequently established opportunities, in terms of conformity. (Indeed society has required educational reporting in terms of conformity). We establish "norms" based on the averages of middle class, healthy individuals who are accustomed to the experiences and values of "our way of life". Those who don't succeed in getting within the magic circle with their performance (or who don't show better than "average" mastery) seldom receive according to their needs. This even though for some the real explanation – of divergence from the "norm" – has more to do with lack of conformity than with lack of ability. We fail to take into account the fact that unfamiliar procedures in the classroom, unfamiliar expectations of teachers and the system, divergence of values, or discontinuity of experiences may account for much of the difference between our accepted "norms" (of achievement or attitude) and performance.

Lack of motivation is frequently ascribed. But in a 1967 publication of the Indian Affairs Branch (Ottawa), edited by H.B. Hawthorne, this statement is found: "Studies indicated there is little reliability to be placed in the common belief that Indians have less motivation than non-Indians. It is not true that Indian children, as a group, lack motivation in the elementary years to do as well".

As Canadians we all lose when we overlook that "Children on the reserves may have had rich experiences in the culture and language of their group." (Hawthorne) We overlook it and we forget that this experience does not prepare them for "normal" school routines and activities.

There are I believe some encouraging signs both within and without the communities of our original Canadians. Not the least of these is improved communications between the Indians themselves. There is a growing confidence and more effective organization. This brings, as a Canadian dividend, a more emphatic and convincing articulation of their understanding, their needs and their hopes. And society's ear is listening harder to that articulation, and hearing better.

In this respect we should not expect from this group of Canadians more than we expect of Canadians generally. The Indians of Canada are not a completely homogeneous group. We should not expect complete unanimity. The lack of unanimity should not be used as a reason for non-activity. There is much room for approaches of difference.

Nor should we expect enthusiasm for externally imposed decree. The comment of Laski, quoted earlier, has particular meaning in this context:

> Men do not resent an environment when they feel they share adequately in its making and in the end for which it is made. But they are bound to be at least apathetic, and possibly hostile, when the sense is wide and deep that they are no more than its instruments.

A statement by the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians (April 1, 1970) is echoed by many others:

> The prime source of information – the actual views of the Indians on the reserves and in the cities – has not been tapped. Yet until the views and desires of the actual constituency have been presented, it cannot be expected that intelligent policies can be drawn up and implemented. We are therefore brought back to the central position of the Hawthorne Report (the *Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada):* "The prime assumption of this report has been that Indians be enabled to make meaningful choices between desirable alternatives; that this should not happen at some time in the future as wisdom grows or the situation improves, but operate now with increasing range."

It is always useful to consider success wherever it occurs. It is also frequently tempting – but not always accurate – to believe that successful procedures elsewhere can be transplanted and will flourish with equal health in our own particular climate. However, there is general agreement that the Danes have been more sensitive and successful in their handling of Eskimo education in Greenland than have we in Canada with our interpretation of education for our native people. A study in this regard was undertaken by C.W. Hobart and C.S. Brent. The study included extensive "on the spot observation and interviewing in both countries". One report of this study is found in the *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* (May, 1966). The conclusions find much in favour of the Greenland program. Such comments (by Hobart and Brent) as the following are worthy of our consideration as we try to define the responsibility of Canadian education:

> The Danes fostered the continuation of traditional Eskimo culture ... Teachers were recruited from the local population – the language of instruction and of the textbooks was Eskimo. The curriculum had local relevance and the book learning was supplemented by training in the traditional skills and crafts given by such figures as the leading kayak builder, seal hunter or sealskin mistress. The purpose of education was to assist people to make their living where they were.

And also:

> In terms of language, attitudes and skills, the education seeks to make available to the student two alternatives and two possible identities, the Greenlandic and the Danish. No doubt few are able to realize both very fully, but *the significant point is that the school does not prejudge the alternatives*. In so far as possible it makes both available to the student.

Again we should not assume that transplanting from "Greenland's icy mountains" to the plains of Canada is completely possible or desirable. Indeed the time for doing some of that mentioned in the quotations may have passed by in some Canadian situations. But there are some "first principles" from which we could learn with advantage.

Above all, to satisfy the Canadian requirement, we must examine and accept the new, or at least growing, self awareness of our Indian community and of many individual Indians; the existing gap between levels of education; a population growth which is estimated to double the number of people on reservations in about 20 years; the rising level of both needs and expectations. These call for application of the best of modern educational knowledge and a more sensitive and responsible Canadian effort.

Canadian identity will not be as it ought to be until those whose ancestors were the first inhabitants are fully admitted into the benefits and privileges of complete citizenship.

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shortness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water.

—John W. Gardner, formerly U.S. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare

Emphatic testimony as to the essential role of education in industrialized society is found in many places. For example, the opening sentence of *Education, Economy and Society* states: "Education is a crucial type of investment for the exploitation of modern technology" (Floud and Halsey). To make the point more firm, Peter F. Drucker, in the second chapter of the same book, introduces his comments with:

> An abundant and increasing supply of highly educated people has become an absolute prerequisite of social and economic development in our world. It is rapidly becoming a condition of national survival. ... The essential new fact is that a developed society and economy are less than fully effective if anyone is educated to less than the limit of his potential ... Society must be an "educated society" today – to progress, to grow, even to survive.

All of which we must admit puts a big load on the educational system.

Few people will disagree with (even though they may qualify) an objective for society of improved economic well-being – for the individual and for the nation. Individual and total expectations do increase. Indeed the extent and the quality of increasing expectations is one measurement of what education is achieving. Many of the aroused expectations won't be met without improved productivity – and better distribution of it. Let's not confine the meaning of productivity to just material things which submit to measurement in dollars or tons – it includes services and non-physical items such as health care and education and recreation. Nor can we accept as a desirable goal more production just because it is technologically possible.

However, it does serve a purpose – in considering what society may properly require of the educational system – to think about the essential ingredients for the production of material and physical "things". Increased productivity does result from, and in part depend on, improved individual and collective skills and education. That is undebatable. The amount of the increase attributable to improved education of our work force (including managerial) has received varying evaluations. The question of a point of diminishing returns may even be raised. But the fact that improvement of educational qualifications is reflected in output and balance sheet has been well documented and accepted.

Before proceeding I think a warning is in order. That warning is with respect to attempts to wholly, or largely, justify the input of money and skills into education by the measurable economic returns. To do so circumscribes that function of education which seeks to further "men's unending search for truth". It will defeat as a function of education the provision of "wisdom and understanding, sensitivity, compassion, and responsibility, as well as intellectual honesty and personal integrity" as "guides in adolescence" and "companions in maturity". In the words of the Hall-Dennis Report: "... a danger lurks in the shadows. Unless a people be on its guard, the economic demands of society can be made to determine what is done in education." It warns that this can mean defining "citizens in terms of economic units and in so doing debases them". The report adds: "There is a dignity and nobility of men that has nothing to do with economic considerations".

Or as Dr. T. H. McLeod (University of Saskatchewan) put it in an address to the C.T.F. Conference on Education Finance (1967): "pre-occupation with justifying education based upon its apparent economic utility... is tactically seductive". He added the opinion that it was nevertheless "strategically wrong".

However there may be those, individuals and organizations, whose opinion is that educational benefit is best measured in terms of its addition to economic output or return; and that its "output" measured in terms of the additional dollars worth of goods created must exceed the dollar input or the enterprise fails. Such I submit is a dangerous and self-defeating concept. Human needs are more than the total of economic and physical needs. The returns from investment of money and skills in education don't fit the jaws of a caliper or don't respond to the conversion scale of even a "floating" Canadian dollar.

However, guided by such warnings, realizing that economic factors must not be the commanding ones if civilization is our quest, society properly can require that the educational system be aware of production needs and possibilities. And educational institutions should expect in turn awareness of the contribution which education can make to our improved production performance.

Both in Canada and the United States there have been a number of relatively recent studies to separate and emphasize the value of a better level of education for more people in stimulating and guaranteeing higher economic productivity. From this growing body of research and comment the very useful generalization included by the Economic Council of Canada in "Perspective 1975" (*Sixth Annual Review*, September, 1969, page 123) seems to serve the purposes of this paper:

> Education is a process that has many facets and many values. It can enhance the quality of life and enrich the lives of individuals. It quickens appreciation of the wonders of knowledge and stimulates the yearnings of mankind for a better world. It stirs the imagination, sharpens the intellect and stimulates creativity. It can also help to generate economic growth; it increases the mobility, adaptability and productivity of people, and raises their level of living.
>
> For these reasons, the Economic Council, in successive Annual Reviews, has given special attention to the need to increase and improve Canadian education. In our *Second Annual Review*, certain basic conclusions were reached about the economics of education. It was pointed out that the income of individuals is in general closely related to the extent of schooling, and that the rates of return from increased investment in education appear to compare favourably with the returns from other kinds of investment. Increased education was estimated to have accounted for a significant part of the increase in productivity and material well-being of Canadians over the past half century.
>
> ... the differences in educational achievements between Canada and the United States were found to be at least one of the significant elements having a bearing on the persistent gap in living standards between the two countries. Our more recent work has revealed that through much of the postwar period Canada has been lagging behind not only the United States but also various European countries in the rate of improvement in the quality of the labour force attributable to education. In our *Fifth Annual Review*, attention was

drawn to the close association between lack of educational opportunities and individual poverty.

The importance attached to this dividend from education and this requirement for improving economic performance is underlined by the added sentence "Our study of the important role of education in Canadian growth and development is continuing".

An earlier statement by former President Kennedy of the United States adds amplification to the economic contribution of education. In a 1963 message to Congress, President Kennedy said:

> This nation is committed to greater advancement in economic growth; and recent research has shown that one of the most beneficial of all such investments is education, accounting for some 40 percent of the nation's growth and productivity in recent years.

Very significant resources are directed to the specific preparation of people for definite, selected occupations. To some extent – and the measurement is incomplete and inexact – the skills needed "to keep the economy rolling", to meet industrial and personal physical needs (and requests)is a factor in deciding the extent of resources so allocated as well as their nature and location. There is undoubtedly a "prevalent concept" that the educational system should provide, in part, for this requirement. It is a frequent criticism of the system that it doesn't provide well enough. This may come from the individual who feels "short changed" because his years at school haven't equipped him well enough to succeed in obtaining or mastering a specific job. It may come from industry claiming inadequate preparation, or insufficient numbers, of people to suit its production needs.

Quite obviously better forecasting as to long-range demand and need would be useful. So too would be better job analyses – to indicate the body of learning which goes into the "best preparation" for the performance of specific occupations. Even when so analyzed, the work content doesn't stay put. Retraining and upgrading is inevitable. In addition such analysis, as a guide to "vocational" training, shouldn't be confined to what's needed to develop the direct skills of manipulation of things. "Training of the hand" is no longer enough – if it ever was.

Dr. H. R. Ziel (in a preface to *Education and Productive Society*, the proceedings of a University of Alberta conference, 1965) indicated something of the difficulty of making and using estimates about the changing world of work:

> ... projections of industrial change can be either banners of hope or harbingers of disappointment to the youth who will enter our productive society, depending on how well these young people are prepared. Previous forms of vocational and technical education, due to their narrow scope, have failed to meet the needs of the individual or of society. Many of the graduates ... have been trained for occupations that are obsolete or filled to capacity ... workers need more training today ... the traditional approach to vocational and technical education needs revision. Advancing technology will demand a flexibility from tomorrow's workers that places a growing emphasis on "know why" as well as "know how". He who trains himself too exclusively in a particular set of skills runs the risk of finding them outmoded, perhaps even before he has mastered them. ... The lack of suitable vocational education programs has resulted in ... under-employment in the skilled trades and over-employment in the unskilled trades. ... to fulfill its obligations to the pupil and society, a realistic effective program of vocational and technical education must get its direction from a philosophy attuned to those needs.

After reviewing some statistics to underline the change in employment requirements because of technology's impact (one farmer now produces enough to feed 24 people compared to 15.1 people in 1949; fifty statisticians in 1960 did tabulation which ten years before required forty-one hundred employees), Dr. Ziel added:

> As educators, we dare not evade the implicit demands for a careful assessment of educational plans in terms of future requirements. The long-range stability of our social system depends on a population of young people properly educated to enter the adult world of tasks and attitudes. The problem involves looking ahead five, ten, twenty years to see what are likely to be the occupational and social needs and attitudes ...; planning the intellectual and social education of each age group in the numbers needed; motivating young people to seek certain types of jobs ...; providing enough suitable teachers; being able to alter all of these as ... society and technology indicate.

It should be noted that Dr. Ziel's comments point beyond preparation for competing in manipulative or technical or even managerial skills. He suggests that "the stability of our social system" is among the stakes and that not only "tasks" but also "attitudes" are involved. Better techniques for forecasting and analysis are a basic tool for satisfactory educational planning.

The "requirement" proposed by Dr. Ziel's remarks is an immense one. I doubt if it is being tackled. Admittedly, projections of future "manpower needs" are more numerous and more thorough. Somehow I feel that even those directly involved make them with some decreasing confidence. William C. Bowen (Princeton University, *Economic Aspects of Education*, 1964) suggests:

> ... a tendency for projections to understate the true future demand for trained manpower. Reasons ... are not hard to find. ... neither individual employers nor professional investigators are able to see the implications of new scientific developments. ... These projection difficulties are particularly pronounced in the case of persons whose training is general ...

Moreover, it would be an error of gross oversimplification to presume that out of manpower studies, as separate and isolated information, can come the quantitative and qualitative guidance we need. Bowen argues that manpower projections are subject to a more "fundamental criticism": "Estimates of the future number of people with a given kind of training who are 'needed' or 'wanted' are devoid of meaning unless one also has a good idea of the relation between the benefits to be obtained by having this number of trained persons *and the costs involved in having them*". He makes the point that manpower studies should be carried out in the context of a more general economic exercise. Such studies are not a responsibility of the educational system. But their guidance is necessary if the educational system is to avoid great waste, of people and money, when it accepts the responsibility of preparing people for the world of work.

Even after, and if, such guidance is available, decisions bristling with difficulty remain. One of these may be to "delimit" the responsibility of the educational system – and concurrently leave with employers more of the training, on the job and designed to meet their specific need for skills.

Obviously, even if this were done, the job would not end there. Society can expect the educational system to provide a maximum of "collective flexibility" in the training of the work force. More must be done to seek out and establish some "common denominators" of groups of occupations. Hopefully this could, with less disruption, facilitate future vertical shifts to cope with new technological demands or horizontal shifts to other occupations. Society has a right to expect that curriculum development – and the research on which it is based – will be better

attuned to the changing realities of today's work world. More effective teacher preparation immediately emerges, or continues, as a major problem. Have we not indeed treated this without enough consideration of the difficulties of vocational preparation? Certainly vocational guidance – its availibility, its effectiveness, and the motivation to make use of it – must, from educational systems and elsewhere, be given a more influential role if education is to play its part in maximizing advantageous economic productivity.

With all of this, the general educational system, as distinct from that part of it directly concerned with preparation for specific employment, is intimately concerned. Vocational guidance and the opportunity to test interest and aptitude in some skill areas are easy examples. Important as these may be, however, they do not meet the full requirement.

In the comments selected from Dr. Ziel's remarks was reference to "the stability of our social system" and to "attitudes" as well as "tasks". Moreover, we surely cannot avoid cognizance of growing evidence (opinion if you like) of "alienation", "frustration", "dehumanization", those more negative features of today's use of technology and its prevalent goals. These characteristics, or effects, to which I have just alluded are obviously more than economic. Just as obviously, in my opinion, they have an economic impact as well. Other factors, not related to manipulative skills, some of which have meaning for those who define general educational roles and goals, also demand the attention of the educational system.

As one example of many other factors, society has moved a long way from the assumption, and practice, of allocating to the owners of industry the sole prerogative to decide conditions of work, the amounts to be required and the distribution of economic returns. Economic considerations, and not just those of the labour force, have played a part in that movement. Even though there will be major agreement that this has produced desirable economic (as well as other) benefits one needs only to note almost any daily newscast to know that serious contention still afflicts the procedure of deciding these and related issues. The economic ramifications of this procedure, and not just of those occasions when differences erupt into strikes or lockouts, are considerable. Human relations are sometimes included as one of the "Rs" of education. They are more than economic, but they also produce economic impact. Schools can be expected to contribute to those understandings, attitudes and values out of which sensitive human relations can grow. This impact, and the required

contribution of the educational system, gets longer comment in another section. It is mentioned here because the economic consequences are frequently under-estimated. Moreover, specific preparation for healthy, human, industrial relations often escapes attention. I find it important to urge in the interest of more productive action, by employer and employee, that society can require more such attention by its institutions of education.

Economic well-being is a product of many factors. The ability to produce – to have those manipulative to managerial skills needed to turn raw material into real wealth – is one of them. Society can expect educational institutions to accept responsibility – but not all of it – for providing opportunity to develop such skills. Generally speaking, a higher level of education means more production and more consumption. Even the training for skills function has increased in complexity. People deserve a diversity of training – "a collective flexibility" – to meet changes in work content and to enable changes in job choices. But even the training of experts and specialists is not enough – social needs and attitudes are important factors in economic well-being. So too are human relations. Those "general" aspects of education which promote judgment, human values and sensitivity assume increasing importance in vocational or technical or even professional preparation.

THE USE AND ABUSE, PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUR ENVIRONMENT

Thou shalt inherit the holy earth as a faithful steward, conserving its resources and productivity from generation to generation. Thou shalt safeguard thy fields from soil erosion, thy living waters from drying up, thy forests from desolation, and protect thy hills from overgrazing by the herds, that thy descendants may have abundance forever. If any shall fail in this stewardship of the land, thy fruitful fields shall become sterile stony ground or wasting gullies, and thy descendants shall decrease and live in poverty or perish from off the face of the earth.

– "The Eleventh Commandment",
Dr. W.C. Lowdermilk, former
Assistant Chief, United States
Conservation Service

There is so much concern, so many warnings, such near astronomical evidence of present damage and future danger with respect to our physical environment that reference to the responsibility of education seems warranted. Perhaps the appropriate reference is less to the environmental problems per se than to these problems as an example of how ill-equipped we are to meet society's proper requirement for continuity of opportunity. There is growing agreement that what is happening to our environment (and why) becomes a challenge for searching examination of the educational system and its role in guaranteeing "continuity of opportunity".

Environmental problems can serve as an example because they are rooted in society's motivation, its selected goals (particularly technological goals) and the methods developed and used to achieve those goals. So much of the prevention and solution (in so far as one is still available) depends on personal understanding and conviction, on public opinion and public will. Society properly can expect educational systems to contribute to such personal understanding and conviction. Education has a responsibility for ensuring "continuity of opportunity". For many, the opportunity to enjoy and benefit from a wholesome environment is decreasing – and at an accelerating rate. This is one of those factors which vigorously, if not violently, thrusts its way into the attention of those with responsibility

for education. (Admittedly other factors, ranging from the need for properly priced and decent housing to violence in our society, might have been selected or included as examples. I can appreciate the argument of those who feel that any one of such might more appropriately have been chosen as illustration of the need for changed, sensitized public opinion and public will. However, "environment", because of near universal and and immediate concern, because it has to do with much of that which we own together but despoil privately – sometimes with public consent–, because it illustrates the need for resolution of the conflict between private will and public good, because everybody is so immersed in cause and cure, appeals to me as useful reference.)

Certainly tomorrow's society (the day after today's) properly can feel cheated of its rightful heritage if today's resolution doesn't stop the accumulation of a gigantic garbage heap on much that is today's beauty and value. And education has to do with encouraging people to develop the vision and the wisdom and the will for such resolution. The price of failure, in economic terms, in aesthetic terms, in human terms of any kind, is beyond calculation. There are those who say the price is the destruction of mankind. One has only to consider our Canadian scene from metropolitain centre through many rural areas to parks threatened by pressure of use and commercial development to be convinced that the price is high. Wrecked and leaking oil tankers, fish dead or unfit to eat, are but some of the recent reminders that the visible price is higher than we thought. The continuing population shift to larger centres already unable to provide for present population is part of the economic price and the human price. And the pressure that whatever is technologically possible (such as petroleum production in the Arctic) should be done just because it is possible and profitable in short-run economic terms, increases the cost.

In an attempt, not at any adequate description of the problem, but to provide some bridge between environmental facts and our topic, let me refer to some relatively recent comments which indicate immensity, urgency and universality. Nigel Calder writing in the *New Statesman* (August 28, 1970) on "The Pollution Threat" comments:

> Not sentiment but toxicity makes you weep for Los Angeles. Californians have breathed from their aerial sewer for many years, telling their children to sit still, when the smog is bad, so as to inhale less of it. During the past few weeks other cities have been gasping for breath, in places where temporary weather conditions have made

> chronic air pollution acute. ... this season's crises in New York, Tokyo, Sydney and elsewnere dramatize a new conjunction of aroused political interest with a technological contest between pollution and counter-pollution.

Here in Canada the *Calgary Herald* (October 7, 1970) reports, under the headline "Pollution Panel Frets Future", a panel discussion among three University of Calgary professors. One of the speakers, Dr. Detomasi (professor of economics), is quoted:

> I am sceptical because of the relation of political and economic power; the people who hold economic power may not see the urgency of the problems. If no solution is found within a few years, we face either disaster or major socio-economic revolution.

(He was described as the "optimist among the three speakers").

Some of the remarks of Dr. D.K. Anderson (a biologist) are reported in this way:

> Assuming it is still possible to avert disaster ... growth-oriented economics must go: the world must aim to stabilize or reduce its total energy and resource use.

Later words of Dr. Anderson can be used to put the matter on our agenda:

> If the ecological problems can be solved short of a revolution, the answer must come from you and I, who must examine our life-style and make our convictions felt. ... Finding the alternatives begins personally; you look at your own life. Sometimes I ask myself, what should I be teaching? And sometimes I look at a map and wonder where I'd establish an ecological bomb shelter.

In further support of the appropriateness of including such an item on our agenda let me refer to these excerpts from *Look Magazine* (January 13, 1970):

> What if some foreign power threatened to poison every major stream? What if this enemy threatened to cast noxious clouds over our cities so that many old people would die outright and children would huddle indoors on sunny days? What if this enemy also boasted that he had the means to inject cancer-producing agents into our food, kill off our wildlife, destroy our most beautiful hills and clog up our lakes? Would we then be willing to get ourselves together against this enemy? ...

> The West has told its sons, "take from this earth as you wish, the more the better, consume what you wish, the more the better. Build what you wish and where you wish, the more the better. Dominate as many markets and as many people as you wish, the more the better. Make as much profit as you wish, the more the better."
>
> The living plant answers: "Please stop. Turn around. You can't keep on doing any of these things. This isn't addressed to your altruism. Just for you and your children to survive, you'll have to stop grabbing at every natural resource; they are running out. You had better consume more carefully. You can no longer build, dominate and profit without considering the true, long-term consequences of your acts. All people are tightly linked together on this spacecraft now. What hurts and costs others will hurt and cost you".

In supporting vein, in a recent address (Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, in the University of Saskatchewan-sponsored "Plain Talk" series) Dr. A.K. Davis (University of Alberta) put it to his audience in these words:

> Much is being said nowadays about the erosion of the Saskatchewan environment and indeed of the Canadian environment. The worsening impact of air pollution, water pollution and land pollution needs no emphasis from me.

He adds:

> Ordinary pollution is a by-product of the erosion of the social environment. ... the answer to air and water pollution is not merely repairing the obvious physical damage – we need to do that too, of course – the answer lies in a drastic change in Canadian values and Canadian organizational structures, and in Canadian public policy.

"Of such stuff" – as an absolute minimum of the consideration of "such stuff" – is meaningful, *educating* education made.

Not too many Canadians, admittedly, have spelled it out in that way as a proper requirement of the educational system. But there are few Canadians who don't have something to say about the deterioration, degradation or destruction of the environment in which they live. Schools and educational systems that have responded, even mildly, to this accumulating crisis have been applauded. Schools can't restrict their agenda to "a world that has already disappeared". (For one thing young people, in

particular, I think won't allow it.) But when schools start to consider in a challenging way whether the answer to the pollution threat "lies in a drastic change in Canadian values and Canadian organizational structures and in Canadian public policy", vigorous opposition will be mounted. However, we did agree that: "The underlying aim of education is to further man's unending search for truth". Stated as a generalization few will argue. Followed through and applied to a specific social and economic problem, such as the cause and cure of pollution, anti-educational missiles complete with fallout will likely explode.

We did agree also (I hope) that "education – with a forward thrust – challenging any claimed natural right of any human structure or institution is the richest capital at mankind's command". If so, then society has a right to see that "thrust" directed at the real, living targets in our own social and economic backyard and a responsibility to support the thrust and the thrusters.

Society should expect education to "thrust" not just at multi-coated "dragons" that once beleagured far-off ancient civilizations or even those closer in time and geography, such as Nazi Germany. Those that exist today – on Canada's own rockbound coasts, crowded metropolitan centres or windswept prairies – should be identified, described and accounted for, and brought before the bar of civilization. Only in that way can the educational system accept its responsibility for "continuity of opportunity". Our children and grandchildren, and our neighbours today, have a right to be able to sing with gusto: "This land is our land".

Society's requirement is that educational systems face such real, living, hurting facts – completely, objectively, honestly. The requirement is for a system that encompasses the wisdom and courage and responsible freedom to do that. The requirement is for a system that has within itself those self generating "seeds of change" which keep current and vigorous that wisdom and courage and responsible freedom.

SELF RENEWAL — OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND OF SOCIETY

If a society hopes to achieve renewal it will have to provide a hospitable environment for creative men and women.

— John W. Gardner, in
Self Renewal

In theory at least, technology's promise (in substituting other forms of energy and skills for those previously supplied by humans), combined with improved social organization, ought to provide more people with increased amounts of "disposable time". A shortening work week, more mechanical devices in the kitchen, longer vacations with pay, earlier retirement with better pensions, improved health science and organization are only some obvious factors which add "free" hours and energy to be used at the individual's discretion. Equally important is the fact that the very thrust of civilization should provide more opportunity and motivation for the use of "discretionary hours" to add quality to individual life and to all society.

The following, much-quoted passage from Dr. Coady's *Masters of Their Own Destiny* (1939) is an appealing comment on quality of life:

> We want our men to look into the sun and into the depths of the sea. We want them to explore the hearts of flowers and the hearts of fellow-men. ... We want them to be men, whole men, eager to explore all the avenues of life and to attain perfection in all their faculties. We want for them the capacity to enjoy all that a generous God and creative men have placed at their disposal. We desire above all that they will discover and develop their own capacities for creation. It is good to appreciate; it is godlike to create. Life for them shall be in terms of all that is good and beautiful, be it economic, political, social, cultural, or spiritual. They are the heirs of all the ages and of all the riches yet concealed. All the findings of science and philosophy are theirs. All the creations of art and literature are for them. If they are wise they will create the instruments to obtain them. They will usher in the new day by attending to the blessings of the old. They will use what they have to secure what they have not.

In that passage Dr. Coady is obviously thinking of more than effective use of "off-work" time. And he is thinking of more than "off-work" man. But it is reasonable to assume that use of off-work hours is part of his hope – for benefits obtained and for contribution to be made.

However it would be wrong to compartmentalize man into an "at-work" and "off-work" human being. As a minimum it would be wrong – in the context of making available the fullest richness of human satisfaction – to overlook the working hours. Many modern developments obstruct the satisfaction which comes from being a meaningful part in a creative process. (Many other developments of course remove much that was drudgery and that consumed disproportionate amounts of physical and emotional energy.) The whole problem doesn't belong in this discussion. But education which encourages motivation and conscience to provide the most satisfying work experiences is, I suggest, on your agenda. As work satisfaction increases, as the relationship between person and purpose of work gets closer, as the drain of numbing physical and emotional energy decreases, so too the chance increases for work well done and satisfying. We all benefit – probably even the G.N.P.

Of great importance is the potential dividend of more energy and will to tackle those problems of the "larger society" which depend in part on everyone's contribution for solutions. This dividend can mean more chance "to look into the sun and the depths of the sea – to explore the hearts of flowers and the hearts of fellow-men". People so satisfied and so released will more likely use "the capacity to enjoy all that a generous God and creative men have placed at their disposal ... to discover and develop their own capacity for creation." They will more likely use and enjoy more fully "all the findings of science and philosophy ... all the creations of art and literature."

And all of us benefit again. Society undoubtedly "indoctrinates by environment". Environment is human and institutional as well as natural and physical. Education has a responsibility to help people achieve the power to sensitively and productively design that environment.

Earlier in this paper I listed Canadian identity as one of the proper concerns of educational systems. The concern for "self renewal" which I am now attempting to endow with credentials to enter this agenda is directly related. Such a relationship, I suggest, is provided in a quotation used in the introduction of the report of the Royal Commission on Arts, Letters and Sciences (1951):

> A nation is an association of reasonable beings united in a peaceful sharing of the things they cherish; therefore to determine the quality of a nation, you must consider what those things are. (St. Augustine, *The City of God*)

"What those things are" were listed in part by Dr. Coady in the passage quoted from *Masters of our Destiny*. "Those things" which help define a nation, which also provide for "self-renewal", are concerns of the school. And so the school faces responsibility for encouraging the "creative man", one capable not only of self-satisfaction, but also of guaranteeing the renewal of society, of determining and guaranteeing the "quality of a nation".

There are factors and forces in the organization of modern society which increase both the need and difficulty: "... there is the dehumanization which comes from the overwhelming of the individual by the mass. We live in an age which calculates in millions and which finds it necessary to give us numbers instead of names. Necessary it may be, but it is also dangerous – the individual finds himself lost and helpless; it is so much easier to acquiesce in nonentity. ... This is a problem which belongs not only to adult life but also, and increasingly, to school life." (F.W. Garforth in *Education and Social Purpose*, 1962) The author poses the essential question: "How can we prevent the loss of self-respect, of the sense of personal worth, in the modern mass society"? Surely that's a proper question for education systems to deal with. Not, again, that sole responsibility rests there – but some of it is there.

In comment on his own question Garforth continued: "Boys and girls at school, men and women after school days, must be persuaded that they matter ... encouraged to assume responsibility, taught to respect human personality, their own and other people's." He opens another door by adding:

> Essential, too, is training in what has been called "clear thinking"; ...there have been enormous advances in the techniques and the means of influencing the thought of millions from a central source; the reiterated statement, the carefully devised sales slogan, the subtle insinuations of cinema – screen and radio play – all these are so powerful that the unwary may surrender to them without any attempt at critical resistance. This is a step towards mental and spiritual slavery, towards the suppression of individuality, from which training in the techniques and pitfalls of thinking can give protection.

That says much about what educational institutions "properly" can be expected to do. If individuals are to "be persuaded that they matter" they must in fact "matter" in the school situation – and must know it by experience there. If they are to be "encouraged to assume responsibility" they must have opportunity to experience responsibility in the school situation. If they are to exercise "critical resistance" to slogans and subtle insinuations, to the skilful use of "techniques and means of influencing ... from a central source" then they must have opportunity to practise "critical resistance". That "critical resistance" may be to the program imposed by the school or the methods of imposing it. The practice of "critical resistance" will include searching analysis of news and editorials and advertising and cartoons and drama and objectives of organizations and practices of institutions. Objective and intense practice of this kind by schools won't be welcomed in all quarters. If society is to expect it society should also support it. If schools are to undertake it they should buckle their seat belts – but if well done it could be an exciting and rewarding ride.

Such comment extends well outside the usual consideration of "leisure time" activities. The reference has been only partially to "discretionary time", to "off-work time", in which activities in addition to recreation should be expected. Included also has been an attempt to draw attention to the part of the total working environment (human as well as physical) in determining both personal and collective accomplishment and enrichment. It is the greatest possible development of creative faculties and the wide opportunity to use them, off the job and on the job, that should define the educational responsibility for "self-renewal".

For a brief moment let's narrow the discussion to some of the items usually considered in the use of "discretionary hours". There is, for example, the role of the "arts" – and the school's opportunity in that respect. Even when we enter through that door the larger view is obvious. Personal pleasure from participation in or just "consumption" of the arts, by all means. But the door opens on other possibilities and contributions. The arts can contribute mightily to perception. And "perceptions are the food, the producers of energy, by which the mind's power grows". (Dr. W. Wees in 1967 Quance Lectures, University of Saskatchewan). The arts help to provide that revolution of mind and spirit which is essential if people are to achieve self-renewal.

Renewal will come for some – and some will make a contribution to renewal – by use of the great world of nature with which Canada is so

splendidly endowed. There too, in addition to restoration of physical and mental health, perceptions "by which the mind's power grows", await and abound. The proper use of that resource is an educational requirement if man and society are to be renewed.

Other possibilities will come to mind. We should not, for example, overlook the importance of just having fun. But no matter how we narrow the use of "discretionary hours" there is support for more development of the "capacity to enjoy all that a generous God and creative man have placed" at our disposal. In that way we determine "the quality of a nation" and underwrite its "self-renewal". But I doubt if this is done well unless it is considered in wider terms than just preparation for the use of "discretionary hours", or just in terms of recreation or participation in the arts. It happens because of a conscious educational objective, which permeates all activities and which is aware of the need for man to be much more in command of his own destiny.

"If a society hopes to achieve renewal" wrote John Gardner in the statement quoted at the beginning of this section, "it will have to provide a hospitable environment for creative men and women". And "renewal" has to be more than rebirth of what was – the species should improve! Society properly should expect schools to plant the seeds of renewal. The resulting growth should have instinct and capacity to draw strength from the best of our heritage. A host of new forces – of technology, of communication, of human understanding, of social organization – can add nourishment to ensure satisfying self-renewal of the individual and of society.

GLOBAL OBLIGATIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES, IN A WORLD THAT "HURTS"

How many ears must one man have
Before he can hear people cry?
How many deaths will it take till he knows
That too many people have died?
How many years can some people exist
Before they're allowed to be free?
How many times can a man turn his head
Pretending he just doesn't see?

– Bob Dylan, *Blowin' in the Wind* *

Have you noticed the response of a group of young people to questions of that kind? If so, you'll feel something that a significant group within our society require – to satisfy their definition of education – from educational opportunities.

The Hall-Dennis report formulates the feeling in part:

> There is a restless search for truth among our young people that leads them to struggle for values rather than power ... the young express a growing concern about world problems ...

Not only in the songs of youth do we get the theme of obligations and opportunities in a world that hurts:

> The widening gap between the developed and developing countries has become a central issue of our time ... (Lester B. Pearson in *Partners in Development*, 1969)

After discussing some of the efforts to reduce this gap, and some of the effects of these efforts, Canada's former Prime Minister (writing as Chairman of the Commission on International Development) adds:

> The question which now arises is whether the rich and developed nations will continue their efforts to assist the developing nations or whether they will allow the structure built up for development co-operation to deteriorate and fall apart.

---

* ©1962 M. WITMARK & SONS
All Rights Reserved
Used by Permission of WARNER BROS. MUSIC

The Commission states as an objective for fortunate countries (such as Canada):

> Not to close all gaps and eliminate all inequality ... It is to reduce disparities and remove inequities. It is to help the poorer countries to move forward, in their own way, into the industrial and technological age ...

To those who raise the question of why, since we have heavy social and economic problems of our own, Mr. Pearson gives three answers:

1. The moral answer. "... It is only right for those who have to share with those who have not."
2. The economic one. "... the appeal of enlightened self interest. ... the fullest possible utilization of the world's resources... helps not only those countries economically weak, but also those strong and healthy.
3. The political one. "... co-operation for development should strengthen a friendly political relationship on the basis of mutual respect."

The general theme of *Partners in Development* has of course been enunciated by others. In a book *The Challenge of Nationhood* (published 1970) the late Tom Mboya of Kenya is recorded:

> The widening gap between the rich and the poor nations must be seen against the background of the so-called revolution of rising expectations in the developing countries. ... This is the problem. It is an international problem not only because world peace will never be fully achieved in a world of "haves" and "have nots", but also because material progress of the world as a whole will be held down if the poor countries do not develop rapidly.

We might even refer to the proposition (cast admittedly in more narrow terms) of Bertolt Brecht in his *Threepenny Opera:*

> Now all you gentlemen who wish to lead us, to teach us to resist from mortal sin, your prior obligation is to feed us: When we've had our lunch, your preaching can begin. (Quoted in *Seeds of Change*, 1970, by Lester R. Brown)

Our task at this point is, of course, not to detail methods or to describe programs for world co-operative development. It is to consider

whether, with respect to such a "central issue of our time" (which by agreement has an impact on world-wide economics, on the possibilities for world peace, and has strong moral accents) education has a responsibility. The answer must be immediately, emphatically and undeniably, "yes".

However, Mr. Pearson expresses concern about continuity of effort (to say nothing of expanded effort) to close the gap and at least control this "central issue". Tom Mboya brings the point home to educational institutions (and of course to others):

> ...in many of the developed countries the majority of the people have no idea as to the seriousness and the size of the problem. What is perhaps more serious is that where the problem is recognized, there is a tendency for the people in the developed countries to assume a distant attitude, while they should be, instead, thoroughly concerned.

There is a problem of not enough, and very likely not accurate enough, information. Even given the information there has been a shortage of sensitivity, of responsibility to others, of public will to produce the necessary response. It is worthwhile being warned again by previously quoted words of Sir Norman Angell:

> ...the knowledge which might have prevented the worst errors of this century was already in the possession of those who made the errors. They failed to apply to the guidance of policy the knowledge they already possessed.

Society has a right to expect that education will help and encourage us to avoid the worst errors of history.

The guilt, of course, is not just that of educational institutions. But guilt, unlike many things, doesn't become less even if shared. Few people would deny Canada should do its share. We have, I understand, accepted as a measurement of our physical effort a contribution of one per cent of our Gross National Product. We have not achieved it – one can well question whether we really intend to. I am afraid it is no overstatement to say that few of our graduates, from even our most sophisticated education institutions, feel much responsibility or will to do anything about it.

Society can properly expect better. Educational systems have a responsibility both to stimulate that expectation and to satisfy it. Facts

about the world in which we live need to be known, analysed and responded to by appropriate public (and private) decisions. There are, as *Partners in Development* reminds us, cogent moral, economic and political reasons for stronger response. The obligations and opportunities are real and immediate. We share them with other nations but they are distinctively Canadian as well. Canadian "continuity of opportunity" depends in part on the nature of our response. That response is, in part, shaped by what happens, how it happens and why it happens, in our schools.

As to what is required, in terms of attitudes (and consequently of relevance of educational objectives) some guidance – at least some inspiration – comes from the pages of the *World Federalist* (Canadian edition) for March-April 1970. In that publication Norman Cousins (President of the World Association of World Federalists and Editor of *Saturday Review*) proposes "A Human Manifesto":

> To redefine man's basic right in the context of changing conditions ... it is imperative for modern man to have a new social contract or a human manifesto, one that can serve as a rallying point for meaningful survival in a nuclear age. ... We, the peoples of this earth, bear the ultimate responsibility for what happens to our world. ...We hold life to be infinitely precious. It must be cherished, nurtured, respected. ... If these beliefs are to have reality, we must accept duties to each other and to the generations of men to come. We have the duty to ennoble life on earth and to protect it against assault, indignity, injustice, discrimination, hunger, disease, and abuse. We have the duty to safeguard the conditions of existence, to develop and use the world's resources for the human good, to protect and preserve the soil so that it will yield ample food, to keep air and water free of poisons. ... Above all, we have the duty to save our world and everything in it from the consequences of senseless violence in a nuclear age. We have the duty to create the conditions of durable peace on earth. ... We pledge ourselves to the goal of a world made safe and fit for man.

Earlier I suggested that support of education was "an active commitment to the dignity of every human being". The inclusion in our objectives of that which encourages and enables people to actively implement a "manifesto" of the kind suggested by Cousins would be tangible evidence of that commitment. Continuity of opportunity for tomorrow's Canadians

requires the attention of educational systems to such an inclusion aimed at such commitment:

> If the people of this country would have their children grow up to respect all men and to seek for others the same opportunities they desire for themselves, it is imperative that the schools help children develop those skills, understandings and attitudes needed by people of all nations to live together in peace and goodwill. (AASA, *Imperatives in Education)*

HUMAN RELATIONS

The most important thing about any household, or school or system of education is the quality of human relations which it sanctions and fosters.

– Dr. M.V.C. Jeffrys

We do learn by doing. The educational system, which functions largely by arranging communication within the classroom or auditorium or library or laboratory or elsewhere, provides an automatic human relations operation. The individual is inevitably located within a larger community of school and community. In addition, through learning materials and media, a relationship with people elsewhere and of other time is established. As a result the school "sanctions and fosters" some kind of human relations.

The need for competency in human relations – built on respect for dignity of the other fellow, designed to pool our "people resources" not fragment them, promoted by doing together not driving apart – finds support in every day's headlines. The headlines may have international, national or local origin. They may deal with doings on the campus, in the factory, on the streets, in the community hall, around the conference table, on the picket line. Whether directly involved or simply subjected to resultant "fall-out", no one escapes the consequences.

> "Men work together" I told him from the heart
> Whether they work together or apart. (Robert Frost)

All of us gain if the efforts are successful. All of us lose if the human skills (and desires) are not adequate to the task of peaceful, productive pooling of "people resources". It is a logical requirement of the educational system to develop the skills and motivate the desires which maximize the chance of such productive "pooling". As anthropologist Ashley Montagu put it:

> We must train for humanity, and reading, writing and arithmetic must be given in a manner calculated to serve the ends of that humanity. ...An intelligence that is not humane is the most dangerous thing in the world. *(On Being Human)*

In supporting argument Montagu noted some 1945 words prepared by Franklin D. Roosevelt for a speech he did not live to deliver:

> We are faced with the pre-eminent fact that if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships – the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together ...

The passing of 25 years has not diminished the wisdom of the statement.

More recently – and closer to home – the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education in the Province of Quebec (1964) made this observation:

> In and through the school, the child makes his first contact with an organized society outside the family circle; thus the school should afford him the richest possible experience of social and community life – it must develop in the child respect and regard for others, team feeling, communal solidarity. This is particularly essential in modern society ... democracy requires of everyone an active participation in civic and professional associations, an interest in public affairs ... in industry, smooth human relations have become almost as important as technical knowledge. Intellectual, cultural, moral and even religious training have too often been regarded from the individual point of view; they must be given social dimensions.

Numerous other reports point (or attempt to point) us in the same direction. The Newsom Report, *Half Our Future* (Great Britain 1963) expressed this opinion: "A man who is ignorant of the society in which he lives, who knows nothing of its place in the world and who has not thought about his place in it, is not a free man even though he has the vote". That obviously goes beyond any narrow definition of human relations. But it comes through clearly that, if he is to be "free", man must know the society in which he lives and understand his relationship with it. This means education with a "social dimension".

How effective is educational effort in providing motivation, in extending the knowledge, in developing the skills of quality human relations? Is some of it indeed frustrating and even destructive? The following statement summarizes a familiar situation:

> At school, the child is *taught by experience* that it is normal for other people to organize his life. *He will be told that he lives in a democracy, which means that people govern themselves.* But he will *know* as an experienced fact that he *must expect to be governed by other people* who know better than he does.

From elementary school to university we present those who come with difficult, if not dangerous, contradictions. For example, the preaching of participatory democracy on the one hand and the autocratic practices of everyday life on the other. Some of the contradiction is rapidly "catching up" on schools and society. Therein lies one explanation of the phenomenon usually called "confrontation". In its development or hindrance of proper human relations, as in other matters, the school inflicts its mistakes on society – we all participate in the results. A question posed by Ashley Montagu looms large:

> We know the problem, we know the solution. Let us then ask ourselves the question: Are we part of the problem or are we part of the solution? *(On Being Human)*

That adds evidence of a requirement for change in content and in method and in decision-making. Attention is again directed to topics relevant to the society in which the student lives with his fellows and his parents – and with which he has some experience. Themes such as war – today's reality and tomorrow's possibility – race, urbanization, education itself, pollution, violence in society, communication, come readily to mind. School conditions and teaching methods to provide more individual analyses, more discussion, more questioning of status quo consensus, are underlined. So too is emphasis on the role of the teacher as "less of an expositor, more of an organizer of the directions of learning, more of an editor, more of a tutor".

If the school is to reorganize and reorient its human relations – internally and externally – an extension of the freedom of the school itself is involved. One implication is for more decisions at the level of the classroom. There is an implication for generally improved resources available as learning aids and environment. The important factor is, of course, the teacher – the reasons which impel people to become teachers; the preparation which provides a chance to develop (and use) the skills which motivate and develop those human relations which give to education a "social dimension".

"In a democratic society" says the Hall-Dennis report, "it is not the task of education to stress the thousand influences and labels dividing man from man, but to establish the necessary bonds and common ground between them. The great art of education lies in providing learning experiences which meet the needs of each, and which at the same time foster that feeling of compassion among human beings which is the greatest strength and bulwark of democracy."

SUMMARY

It will be noted that the status of "prevalent concept" (if by that is meant demonstrable agreement by large numbers of Canadians) is not claimed for many of the "requirements" suggested in preceding pages.

It will also be noted that frequent use has been made of quotations. Hopefully the quotations represent something of a "prevalent concept". It may even be noted that many of these (too many) are from sources other than Canadian. That in itself is commentary. Undoubtedly there are more "made in Canada" expressions of fact or opinion than I have used to support my analysis and contentions. Frequently they are difficult to find – and often not published in a form which makes them readily available from the usual sources.

Limited use has been made of statistics to give numerical definition to "requirements". Quite obviously the relevant statistics are important – thankfully this responsibility is that of others participating in the study.

In the main I have attempted comment on those "requirements" which might be called "ends" rather than "means". That is not meant to imply any lack of importance for "means", or of the part which "means" adopted have in determining the "ends" achieved. But if there are "first principles" to guide the allocation of resources to education these seem to me to lie in the "ends" expected from that allocation.

As indicated at the outset there are numerous alternative ways of structuring a discussion about "what society may properly require of the educational system". Moreover, many may feel there have been important omissions. There is, for example, a requirement that we provide better service for those with emotional and learning disorders.

> Twelve percent of the population up to nineteen years of age, or no less than *a million children and youth* in Canada today, require attention, treatment and care because of emotional and learning disorders.

In those words a recent commission introduces its report entitled *One Million Children*.

More specific attention might have been directed to adult education. The need for retraining and upgrading has been noted but there is a

larger field. A number of school systems do provide some opportunities but it seems to me there are untouched possibilities of considerable magnitude. What about "Mrs. Jones at her ironing board" and her claim for attention by the publicly-supported school system?

And, you well may ask, what about kindergarten and even pre-kindergarten? There is accumulating evidence to support the value of investment there. There is growing evidence, too, that for too long we have "under-invested" in the earliest stages of educational opportunity. In an address to the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association (November, 1970) Dean Arthur Kratzmann (College of Education, University of Saskatchewan, Regina) referred to a book seven years ago by Benjamin Bloom (University of Chicago). Bloom reviewed "almost a thousand studies of human development". These studies, said Dr. Kratzmann "revealed that growth" (in physical, mental, social and emotional development) "is rapid in early life, is somewhat less rapid during adolescence, and tapers off rapidly as one leaves his teens". He added "not only do we ignore this evidence, but we do a complete topsy-turvey around in applying our human and physical resources to various levels of education".

As another kind of example there are the specific requirements seen by a host of organizations. Those who have strong confidence in co-operatives or private enterprise or trade unionism or farmer organization or other identifiable units of human activity can advance claims and resulting demands on the educational system.

Indeed we might have examined objectives as set out by various organizations representative of significant sections of Canadian society. Trade unions, farm organizations, Chambers of Commerce, professional organizations, student groups and parent-teacher associations are among those who in varying degrees have studied the scene and have articulated points of view. Their findings and reflections merit consideration. They constitute part of the voice of the people whose needs are to be served. Society can expect educational systems to consult - widely and regularly – such organizations. And such organizations should do more to refine their "expectations" and introduce them for wide discussion – both inside and outside of their own ranks. That, we can "properly" expect of them.

Hopefully the seven topics by which I chose to identify the "requirements", and around which my main comments have been

grouped, do not exclude the legitimate aspirations of Canadians organized in distinct groups for definite purposes. Hopefully also they do not ignore the claims of the handicapped, the general adult or the very young.

It may be well to restate some "requirements", in addition to the seven specifically designated, which seem to emerge as part of the entire process.

1. The need for a more significant educational response to the "accelerating velocity of history".

2. The need for a more precise agreement and statement about the aims of education. When "goals are not clear, or not adequately understood, the result is likely to be a serious wastage of resources and considerable frustration. A much clearer consensus among Canadians is needed concerning appropriate goals for post-secondary education." (Economic Council of Canada, *Seventh Annual Review*, September 1970) (The Council, in this report, dealt only with post-secondary education, but the comments can apply to other parts of education.) The educational system can be expected to give stronger leadership to the development of "a clearer consensus among Canadians" as to "appropriate goals". After recognizing the complexity of this task the Economic Council emphasizes "... it is urgent that strong and continuing efforts be made to define and clarify the aims and objectives ... both of particular institutions and of the larger systems in which they operate. The institutions themselves should play a major role in these efforts, but in any event the community at large, through its elected representatives, will undoubtedly press for clarification."

3. As the competition for resources increases between public and private services, and between segments of the public services, the educational system will have to be more concerned with "accountability". In other words, it will have to work harder and more effectively to justify the resources allocated. In particular it will be required to justify more convincingly the requests for any enlarged allocation. The dangers of requiring "quantitative" justification have been referred to. So too have the difficulties of "qualitative" justification. But difficult or not, the educational system, and the individuals for whom educational facilities are provided, must insist to the limit on the incorporation of qualitative values as a significant part of the measurement.

4. The need to recognize, as part of the answer to "accountability", a more effective, school-to-parent, school-to-community relationship. This more effective relationship stands on its own feet for other reasons. The pattern of educational decisions at the level of the school classroom is developing strength and action. But some of the gain is lost if, for the decisions of a central agency, we merely substitute the decision of a school superintendent or principal or teacher, taken without understanding and consultation with the immediate educational constituency.

5. The need to recognize and use the hopes and ideas of students in determining educational ends, means and attitudes. We need to give students the opportunity for a "really positive relationship with education" – their education and that of their fellows. A growing number of students are no longer willing to be just consumers of prefabricated and even partially pre-digested educational concepts and processes. That fact, if the educational system takes advantage of it, may indeed represent the best hope for purposeful change.

Finally, let me attempt to put into one capsule the over-riding requirement. You may not agree that today's world is a new world. You can hardly disagree that "the increasing velocity of history" has changed it immensely, that much of that change is here to stay, and that education has to "speed up" to "catch up". Moreover, in the main, our students have out-distanced the educational system. The logic of the over-riding requirement for awareness of the real world in which we live is contained in a comment by Ritchie Calder quoted in John McHale's *The Future of the Future:*

> ... the generation which was born into the atomic age, had their births registered by computer, and had Sputnik as their zodiacal sign ... take for granted the marvels which still bewilder their elders. They are also more aware that most of the arguments of what we call "international" politics are irrelevant. ... Mankind has become an entity, interdependent through our common necessities. The post atom generation senses all this: their elders are still schizophrenic – recognizing the facts of a shrunken world but rejecting the implications which upset outworn creeds.

REFERENCES

1. American Association of School Administrators. Commission on Imperatives in Education. *Imperatives in Education.* Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1966. 180 p.

2. Angell, Sir Norman. World tensions and the education of man. *Toronto Education Quarterly* 1: 2-8, Summer 1962.

3. Aristotle. *Politics.* (C.380-320 B.C.). Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Toronto: Macmillan, 1943. 337 p.

4. Bereday, George Zygmunt Fijalkowski. School systems and mass demands. *Essays on World Education: The Crisis of Supply and Demand.* London: Oxford University Press, 1969. 359 p.

5. Bloom, Benjamin Samuel. *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics.* New York: Wiley, 1964. 237 p.

6. Bowen, William Gordon. *Economic Aspects of Education.* Three essays. (Research Report Series, No. 104) Princeton: Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University, 1964. 122 p.

7. Brown, Lester Russell. *Seeds of Change.* The Green Revolution and Development in the 1970's. Published for the Overseas Development Council. London: Praeger, 1970. 205 p.

8. Bruner, Jerome S. *The Process of Education.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960. 97 p.

9. Calder, Nigel. Pollution Threat – 2. Keeping up with Los Angeles. *New Statesman* 80: 238-239, No. 2058, August 28, 1970.

10. Canada. *Report of the Royal Commission on Billingualism and Biculturalism.* Volume 2, Education. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1968. 347 p.

11. Canadian Teachers' Federation. *The Piper and the Tune.* The 1967 Conference on Education Finance. Ottawa: Canadian Teachers' Federation, 1967. 120 p.

12. Carroll, Lewis. [pseud. Charles Lutwidge Dodgson] *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland.* London: Macmillan, 1950. 177 p. (Originally published, London: Macmillan, 1865)

13. Coady, Moses Michael. *Masters of Their Own Destiny*. The Story of the Antigonish Movement of Adult Education Through Economic Co-operation. London: Harper & Brothers, 1939. 170 p.

14. The Commission on Emotional and Learning Disorders in Children. *One Million Children*. A national study of Canadian children with emotional and learning disorders. Toronto: Commission on Emotional and Learning Disorders, 1970. 521 p.

15. Coombs, Philip H. *The World Educational Crisis*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968. 241 p.

16. Cousins, Norman. Sovereignty of man -- a human manifesto. *World Federalist*. (Can. ed.) 15: 3-4, March/April, 1970.

17. Dewey, John. *My Pedagogic Creed*. Chicago: E.L. Kellogg, 1897, 36 p.

18. Economic Council of Canada. *Sixth Annual Review: Perspective 1975*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969. 184 p.

19. Economic Council of Canada. *Seventh Annual Review: Patterns of Growth*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970. 109 p.

20. Gardner, John William. *Self Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965. 141 p.

21. Garforth, Francis William. *Education and Social Purpose*. London: Daily Express Book Department, Beaverbrook Newspapers Limited, 1962. 174 p.

22. Gibran, Kahlil. *The Prophet*. London: Heinemann, 1966. 114 p. (Originally published New York: Knopf, 1923)

23. Great Britain. Ministry of Education. Central Advisory Council for Education. *Half our Future*. (The Newsom Report) London: H.M.S.O., 1963. 299 p.

24. Halsey, A.H., Jean Floud and C. Arnold Anderson. (eds). *Education, Economy, and Society*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964. 625 p.

25. Hawthorn, H.B. *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada*. A Report on Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies in Two Volumes. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1966.

26. Hobart, C.W., and C.S. Brant. Eskimo education, Danish and Canadian: a comparison. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 3: 47-68, May 1966.

27. Howe, Harold. *Picking up the Options.* 2nd edition. Washington: National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals, 1968. 257 p.

28. Laski, Harold Joseph. *Liberty in the Modern State.* Rev. ed. Toronto: Macmillan, 1949. 175 p.

29. *Living and Learning.* Report of the Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario. (The Hall-Dennis Report). Toronto: The Newton Publishing Company, 1968. 221 p.

30. Mboya, Tom. *The Challenge of Nationhood.* New York: Praeger, 1970. 278 p.

31. McHale, John. *The Future of the Future.* New York: Braziller, 1969. 322 p.

32. Montagu, Ashley. *On Being Human.* 2nd. ed. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1967. 128 p.

33. *National Purpose.* (Life periodical) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960. 146 p.

34. *Partners in Development.* Report of the Commission on International Development. Chairman: Lester B. Pearson. New York: Praeger, 1969. 399 p.

35. *Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education in the Province of Quebec.* (The Parent Commission) Five volumes. Quebec: Printer for Government of Province of Quebec, 1965-1966.

36. *Report, Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences,* 1949-1951. Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951. 517 p.

37. St. Augustine. *The City of God.* (Completed in 22 books C. 426 A.D.) Translation by J.W. Wand, abridged edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1963. 452 p.

38. Scarfe, Neville. The Aims of Education in a Free Society, pp. 65-90 in *The Second Canadian Conference on Education: A Report.* Montreal, March 4-8, 1962. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

39. *Secondary Education. A Report of the Advisory Council on Education in Scotland.* Cmd 7005. Edinburgh: H.M.S.O., 1947. 109 p.

40. Thoreau, Henry David. *On the Duty of Civil Disobedience.* London: Peace News, 1963. 21 p. (First printed as "Resistance to Civil Government" in Elizabeth Peabody's *Esthetic Papers,* 1849.)

41. Wees, Wilfred Rusk. *The Way Ahead.* (Quance lectures in Canadian education, 1967) Scarborough, Canada: Gage, 1967. 83 p.

42. Ziel, Henry Richard (ed.) *Education and Productive Society.* Conference proceedings, University of Alberta, June 1-2, 1964, Toronto: Gage, 1965. 217 p.